The Temptation of Christ in the Wilderness: A Lesson on How Not to Pray

Pokušenje Chrystusa w pusćinje: Lekcija wo tym, kak so njemodliš

基督在曠野受試探：一堂關於「如何不該禱告」的課

- Frank Leo 劉宗唐 משה הלוי *Φραγκίσκος Μωυσῆς Λευίτάκης*
משה לוין (לעווין)

I. Introduction | Zawod | 導論

The narrative of Christ's temptation in the wilderness (Matthew 4:1–11; Luke 4:1–13; Mark 1:12–13) has been explored across two millennia of Christian scholarship primarily as a Christological event — a demonstration of Christ's sinlessness, His messianic identity, and His victory over Satan. While these readings are undoubtedly correct, they do not exhaust the pedagogical depth of the passage. This essay proposes a complementary hermeneutical lens: that the three temptations of Christ constitute a divine tutorial on **how not to pray** — that is, they expose the three fundamental ways in which human beings distort prayer from an act of humble submission into an act of blasphemy.

Stawizna wo pokušenju Chrystusa w pusćinje (Matej 4,1–11; Luka 4,1–13; Marek 1,12–13) bu přez dwaj lěttysacaj w křesćanskim slědźenju hłownje jako christologiski podawk wobhladowana — jako pokaz Chrystusoweje bjezhrěšnosće, Jeho mesianiskeje identity a Jeho dobyća nad Satanom. Hačrunjež tute čitanja bjezdwěla

prawe su, njewučerpaja wone pedagogisku hłubokosć tutoho teksta. Tutón esej namjetuje dodawacy hermeneutiski wid: zo tři pokušenja Chrystusa božanski **nawod wo njeporjadnym modlenju** (Njemódlitwoučbu) tworja — to rěka, wone wotkrywaja tři zasadne puće, po kotrychž człowjekojo modlitwu z akta ponižneje poddanosće do akta blasfemije přetworitej.

基督在曠野受試探的敘事（馬太福音4:1-11；路加福音4:1-13；馬可福音1:12-13）在兩千年的基督教學術研究中，主要被視為一個基督論事件——展示基督的無罪性、祂的彌賽亞身份，以及祂對撒但的得勝。這些解讀無疑是正確的，但並未窮盡該段經文的教導深度。本文提出一個互補的詮釋學視角：基督所受的三重試探構成了一部神聖的**「如何不該禱告」之教程**——也就是說，它們揭露了人類將禱告從謙卑順服之舉扭曲為褻瀆之行的三種根本方式。

The logic is as follows. Satan's three temptations are not random provocations; they are **paradigmatic distortions of the creature's relationship to the Creator**, each mirroring a way in which fallen humanity approaches God in prayer — not to submit, but to use; not to worship, but to manipulate; not to receive, but to demand. Jesus' responses, drawn exclusively from Deuteronomy, model the posture of authentic prayer: dependence, trust, and exclusive worship.

Logika je slědowaca: Satanowe tři pokušenja njejsu připadne prowokacije; su **paradigmatiske skřiwjenja poćaha stworjenja ke Stwórcej**, z kotrychž kóžde jedyn puć wotbłyšćuje, po kotrymž padnjene człowjestwo so k Bohu w modlitwje bliži — nic zo by so poddało, ale zo by wužiwało; nic zo by so modliło, ale zo by manipulowało; nic zo by přijimało, ale zo by žadało. Wotmołwy Jězusa, wotnjesene wuključnje z 5. Knihi Mojzesoweje (Deuteronomium), modeluja prawy postoj awtentiskeje modlitwy: wotwisnosć, dowěru a wuključne česćowanje.

其邏輯如下：撒但的三重試探並非隨意的挑釁，而是受造物與造物主關係的典型扭曲，每一重都映照出墮落的人類在禱告中接近上帝的一種方式——不是為了順服，而是為了利用；不是為了敬拜，而是為了操縱；不是為了領受，而是為了索取。耶穌的回應全部引自申命記，為我們示範了真正禱告的姿態：倚靠、信賴，以及專一的敬拜。

As **Derek Prince** observed in his extensive teaching on prayer and spiritual warfare, prayer is not a mechanism for bending God's will to ours, but a discipline of aligning our will with His. Prince consistently warned that when believers approach prayer as a tool for manipulating spiritual reality rather than as communion with a sovereign God, they have crossed the line from faith into what he termed "spiritual presumption" — a form of witchcraft masquerading as piety.[1] Similarly, **Charles Haddon Spurgeon** cautioned: "Prayer is not overcoming God's reluctance, but laying hold of His willingness." For Spurgeon, the very grammar of prayer must begin with submission, or it becomes an exercise in idolatry.[2]

Kaž **Derek Prince** w swojim wobšěrnym wučenju wo modlitwje a duchownym wojowanju wobkedźbowaše, modlitwa njeje mechanizm za přikłónjenje Božeje wole k našej, ale disciplina zjednoćenja našeje wole z Jeho. Prince stajnje warnjowaše, zo hdyž wěriwi so modlitwje jako nastroju za manipulaciju duchowneje reality a nic jako zhromadnosći ze suwerenym Bohom bliježja, su woni hranicu wot wěry do toho, štož wón „duchownu přetrjebnosć" (Geistliche Vermessenheit) mjenowaše, překročili — formu wěšćerstwa, kotraž so jako pobožnosć maskuje.[1:1] Runje tak **Charles Haddon Spurgeon** warnjowaše: „Modlitwa njeje přewinanje Božeho wotpokazanja, ale zasadźenje do Jeho zwólniwosće." Za Spurgeona dyrbi sama gramatika modlitwy z poddanosću započeć, hewak stanje so z wukonom modłarstwa.[2:1]

正如**葉光明（Derek Prince）**在其關於禱告與屬靈爭戰的大量教導中所觀察到的，禱告並非將上帝的旨意扭轉至順從我們的機制，而是一門將我們的意志與祂的旨意對齊的操練。葉光明一貫警告，當信徒將禱告視為操縱屬靈實相的工具，而非與至高上帝的相交時，

他們便已從信心跨入了他所稱的「屬靈僭越」——一種偽裝成敬虔的巫術。[1:2] 同樣，**司布真（Charles Haddon Spurgeon）**也曾告誡：「禱告不是克服上帝的不情願，而是把握祂的樂意。」對司布真而言，禱告的語法本身必須以順服為起始，否則便成為偶像崇拜的操練。[2:2]

Pastor Stephen Tong (唐崇榮牧師), in his Reformed Evangelistic Movement (STEMI) preaching, has articulated this principle with particular force. Tong teaches that the essence of prayer is *theocentric*, not *anthropocentric*: "When we pray, we do not come to inform God of what He does not know, nor to persuade Him of what He is unwilling to do. We come to submit our smallness before His greatness." Tong identifies the root sin in distorted prayer as the reversal of the Creator-creature distinction — making God a servant of human desire rather than the sovereign Lord whom we serve.[3]

Farář Stephen Tong (唐崇榮) je tutón princip w swojim reformowanym ewangelizaciskim hibanju (STEMI) z wosebitej mocu artikulowaše. Tong wuči, zo bytosć modlitwy je *teocentriska*, nic *antropocentriska*: „Hdyž so modlimy, njepřińdźemy, zo bychmy Boha wo tym informowali, štož njeznaje, ani zo bychmy Jeho wo tym přeswědčili, štož nochce činić. Přińdźemy, zo bychmy swoju małosć před Jeho wulkosću poddali." Tong identifikuje korjenjowy hrěch w skřiwjenej modlitwje jako wróćenje rozdźěla mjez Stwórcom a stworjenjom — Boha k służobnemu človjeskeje žadosće činić, město zo by wón suwereny Knjez był, kotremuž my służimy.[3:1]

唐崇榮牧師在其歸正福音運動（STEMI）的講道中，以格外有力的方式闡明了這一原則。唐牧師教導，禱告的本質是以神為中心的，而非以人為中心的：「當我們禱告時，我們不是來告訴上帝祂所不知道的事，也不是來說服祂做祂不願做的事。我們是來將自己的渺小降服在祂的偉大面前。」唐牧師指出，扭曲禱告中的根本罪惡在於顛倒了造物主與受造物之間的分際——使上帝成為人類慾望的僕役，而非我們所事奉的至高主宰。[3:2]

This essay will examine each of the three temptations in turn, demonstrating how each corresponds to a specific form of blasphemous prayer, before drawing together the theological synthesis.

Tutón esej budźe kóžde z třoch pokušenjow po rjedźe přepytać, pokazujo, kak kóžde k specifiskej formje blasfemiskeje modlitwy wotpowěduje, prjedy hač teologisku syntezu hromadźe sćahnje.

本文將依次考察三重試探的每一重，論證每一重如何對應一種特定形式的褻瀆性禱告，最後綜合闡述其神學意涵。

II. The First Temptation: Making Stones into Bread — The Prayer That Demands God Alter Reality for Our Comfort

Prěnje pokušenje: Kamjenje do chlěba přeměnić — Modlitwa, kotraž žada, zo by Bóh realitu za naš komfort změnił

第一重試探：將石頭變成餅——要求上帝改變現實以遂我們心意的禱告

A. The Biblical Text | Biblijski tekst | 經文

Matthew 4:2–4 — "After fasting forty days and forty nights, he was hungry. The tempter came to him and said, 'If you are the Son of God, tell these stones to become bread.' Jesus answered, 'It is written: Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God.'" (cf. Deuteronomy 8:3)

Matej 4,2–4 — „A jako bě štyrceći dnjow a štyrceći nocow so postił, bu hłódny. A spytař přistupi k njemu a rjekny: ‚Sy-li Syn Boži, praj, zo tute kamjenje chlěb budu.' Wón pak

wotmołwi a rjekny: ‚Pisane steji: Čłowjek njeje žiwy wot chlěba samoho, ale wot kóždeho słowa, kotrež z rta Božeho wuchadźa.'" (hlej Deuteronomium 8,3)

馬太福音**4:2-4** —「他禁食四十晝四十夜，後來就餓了。那試探人的進前來，對他說：『你若是神的兒子，可以吩咐這些石頭變成食物。』耶穌卻回答說：『經上記著說：人活著，不是單靠食物，乃是靠神口裡所出的一切話。』」（參申命記8:3）

B. Surface Reading and Deeper Meaning | Powjerchowy čitanje a hłubši zmysł | 表層閱讀與深層意涵

At the surface level, this temptation concerns physical hunger and the provision of food. Jesus has fasted for forty days; He is authentically, bodily hungry. Satan's suggestion seems almost reasonable: *You have the power; why suffer needlessly?* But the temptation is not fundamentally about bread. It is about the **ontological restructuring of created reality to serve the creature's immediate desire**.

Na powjerchowym levelu so tute pokušenje na ćělesny hłód a zastaranje z jědźu poćahuje. Jězus je so štyrceći dnjow postił; je woprawdźe, ćělnje hłódny. Satanowy namjet so skoro rozumny zda: *Maš móc; čehodla bjezpotrjebnje ćerpiš?* Ale pokušenje njeje zasadnje wo chlěbu. Je wo **ontologiskim přestrukturowanju stworjeneje reality, zo by přisłužała bjezposrědnej žadosći stworjenja**.

在表層上，這個試探關乎肉體的飢餓與食物的供應。耶穌已經禁食四十天，祂確實在肉體上飢餓。撒但的建議看似幾乎合理：你有這能力，何必白白受苦？ 然而這個試探根本上不是關於餅。而是關於對受造現實進行本體性的重構，以服務受造物的即時慾望。

The stones of the Judean wilderness are not bread. They are stones. They were created as stones and exist as stones within the order God established. To turn them into bread would be to demand that the fundamental structure of created reality bend to personal desire — not because God has ordained such a transformation, but because the creature wills it.

Kamjenje Judejskeje pusćiny njejsu chlěb. Su kamjenje. Buchu jako kamjenje stworjene a eksistuja jako kamjenje w porjadku, kotryž Bóh postaji. Je do chlěba přeměnić by rěkało žadać, zo by so zasadna struktura stworjeneje reality k wosobnej žadosći skłóniła — nic dokelž je Bóh tajku přeměnu postajił, ale dokelž stworjenje to chce.

猶太曠野的石頭不是餅。它們是石頭。它們被造為石頭，以石頭的形態存在於上帝所建立的秩序之中。將石頭變為餅，就是要求受造現實的根本結構向個人慾望屈服——不是因為上帝命定了如此的轉變，而是因為受造物自己想要。

This is precisely what happens when human beings pray for God to **change the basic conditions of their existence** to match their desires rather than submitting their desires to God's providential arrangement. It is the prayer that says, *"Lord, the reality you have given me is not the reality I want. Change it."* This is not a prayer of faith; it is a prayer of rebellion dressed in pious language.

To je dokładnje to, štož so stanje, hdyž človjekojo so k Bohu modla, zo by **zakładne wuměnjenja jich eksistency změnił**, zo bychu jich žadosćam wotpowědowali, město zo bychu swoje žadosće Božemu zastaranju poddali. Je to modlitwa, kotraž praji: *„Knježe, realita, kotruž sy mi dał, njeje ta realita, kotruž chcu. Změń ju."* To njeje modlitwa wěry; je to modlitwa zběžka, kotraž je do pobožneje rěče zdrasćena.

這正是人類在禱告中要求上帝改變其存在的基本條件以符合自身慾望，而非將自身慾望順服於上帝的護理安排時所發生的事。這是一種說：*「主啊，祢給我的現實不是我想要的現實。請改變它。」*的禱告。這不是信心的禱告；這是披上敬虔語言外衣的悖逆禱告。

John MacArthur, in his exposition of Matthew 4, notes that Satan's strategy was to induce Jesus to act independently of the Father's will — to use divine power for self-serving purposes. MacArthur writes: "Satan was asking Jesus to use His divine prerogative to serve Himself rather than to depend upon the Father's provision in the Father's time and in the Father's way." For MacArthur, this is the archetype of all

self-serving prayer: asking God to serve our agenda rather than seeking to discern His.[4]

John MacArthur w swojim wuswětlenju Mateja 4 podšmórnje, zo strategija Satana bě, Jězusa k njewotwisnosći wot wole Wótca pohnuć — božsku móc za sebjesłužne zaměry wužić. MacArthur piše: „Satan žadaše wot Jězusa, zo by swoju božsku prawosć wužiwał, zo by sebi samemu służił, město zo by so na zastaranje Wótca we wěstym času Wótca a we wěstym puću Wótca spušćił." Za MacArthura je to archetip wšeje sebjesłužneje modlitwy: Boha prosyć, zo by našej agendźe służił, město zo bychmy so wo to starali, jeho wolu spóznać.[4:1]

約翰·麥克乃瑟（John MacArthur）在其對馬太福音第四章的闡釋中指出，撒但的策略是誘使耶穌獨立於天父的旨意而行動——將神聖的能力用於自我服務的目的。麥克乃瑟寫道：「撒但要求耶穌使用祂神聖的特權來服事自己，而非在天父的時間、以天父的方式倚靠天父的供應。」對麥克乃瑟而言，這是一切自我服事式禱告的原型：要求上帝服務我們的議程，而非尋求辨明祂的旨意。[4:2]

N.T. Wright deepens this insight by locating the temptation within the broader narrative of Israel's wilderness experience. Wright argues that Jesus is reliving Israel's forty-year wilderness journey in forty days, and where Israel failed, Jesus succeeds. Israel grumbled for bread and received manna (Exodus 16), but their grumbling revealed a fundamental distrust in God's providential ordering of reality. Jesus, by contrast, refuses to remake reality according to His own hunger. Wright observes: "Jesus isn't just resisting a personal temptation. He is winning the battle Israel lost — the battle of trusting God's provision within God's ordering of the world, rather than demanding that the world be re-ordered to suit oneself."[5]

N.T. Wright tute dohlady přez to hłubši čini, zo pokušenje do šěršeje naratiwy Israelskeje pusćinoweje nazhonjenja zasadźuje. Wright twjerdźi, zo Jězus štyrcećilětne

pusćinowe pućowanje Israela w štyrceći dnjach znowa žiwi, a hdźež Israel zwrěšći, Jězus wuspěšny je. Israel so nad chlěbom hóršeše a manu dósta (2. Kniha Mojzesowa 16), ale jich hóršenje wozjewi zasadnu njedowěru do Božeho zastaranskeho porjadowanja reality. Jězus napřećo tomu wotpokaza, realitu po swojim hłodźe přetworić. Wright wobkedźbuje: „Jězus njeje jenož wosobnemu pokušenju spjećował. Wón je bitku dobył, kotruž Israel zhubiła — bitku, dowěrić Božemu zastaranju znutřka Božeho porjadowanja swěta, město zo by žadał, zo by swět po swojich žadosćach přeporjadowany był."[5:1]

湯姆·賴特（N.T. Wright）將這一試探置於以色列曠野經歷的更廣敘事脈絡中，從而深化了這一洞見。賴特論證，耶穌正在四十天之中重歷以色列四十年的曠野之旅，而以色列在何處失敗，耶穌便在何處得勝。以色列為食物發怨言而得了嗎哪（出埃及記16章），但他們的抱怨暴露了對上帝護理性地安排現實的根本不信任。相較之下，耶穌拒絕按照自己的飢餓來重塑現實。賴特觀察道：「耶穌不僅僅是在抵擋個人的試探。祂正在贏得以色列所輸掉的那場戰役——那場在上帝對世界的秩序安排之內信靠上帝供應的戰役，而非要求世界按自己的心意被重新安排。」[5:2]

Jordan Peterson, approaching the text from a psychological-archetypal perspective, offers a complementary reading. In his lectures on the biblical series, Peterson identifies the first temptation as the archetype of the human desire to circumvent suffering through immediate gratification. He notes that the willingness to endure privation without demanding that reality immediately conform to one's needs is the foundation of all genuine moral development. "The person who cannot tolerate the desert — who immediately reaches for the easy transformation of stones into bread — is the person who will never develop the character necessary to serve a purpose higher than their own appetites."[6] While Peterson's framework is not conventionally theological, his insight converges with the patristic understanding: that demanding God serve our

hunger — whether physical, emotional, or existential — is a refusal of the formative suffering through which character and faith are refined.

Jordan Peterson, přistupujo k tekstej z psychologisko-archetypiskeje perspektiwy, poskićuje dodawace čitanje. W swojich přednošowanjach wo bibliskej seriji identifikuje Peterson prěnje pokušenje jako archetip človjeskeje žadosće, ćerpjenje přez bjezposrědne spokojenje wobińć. Wón podšmórni, zo zwólniwosć, sej njedostatk bjez žadanja, zo by so realita hnydom přiměriła, znjesć, je zakład wšeho woprawdźiteho moralneho wuwića. „Človjek, kotryž pusćinu njemóže znjesć — kotryž hnydom za lochkim přeměnjenjom kamjenjow do chlěba saha — je človjek, kotryž ženje charakter njebudźe wuwić, kotryž je trjeba, zo by zaměrej wyšemu hač swójske ćělne žadosće służił."[6:1] Hačrunjež Petersonowy framework njeje konwencionelnje teologiski, jeho dohlad so z patristiskym zrozumjenjom zběhnje: zo žadanje, zo by Bóh našemu hłodej — hač ćělnemu, emocionalnemu abo eksistencialnemu — służił, je wotpokazanje formowaceho ćerpjenja, přez kotrež so charakter a wěra rafinujetej.

喬丹·彼得森（Jordan Peterson）從心理學-原型學的角度切入文本，提供了一個互補的解讀。在其聖經系列講座中，彼得森將第一重試探辨識為人類渴望通過即時滿足來規避苦難的原型。他指出，願意承受匱乏而不要求現實立即順應自身需求，是一切真正道德發展的根基。「那無法忍受曠野的人——立即伸手要將石頭輕易變成餅的人——就是永遠無法培養出服事高於自身慾望之目的所需品格的人。」[6:2] 雖然彼得森的框架並非傳統意義上的神學框架，但其洞見與教父傳統的理解匯合：要求上帝服事我們的飢餓——無論是肉體的、情感的還是存在性的——就是拒絕那煉淨品格與信仰的塑造性苦難。

Voddie Baucham articulates this principle in the context of prosperity theology, which he regards as the modern institutionalization of the first temptation. Baucham warns that the "name it and claim it" movement fundamentally misunderstands the nature of prayer by treating God as a cosmic vending machine. "When your prayer life is about getting God to change your circumstances rather than about submitting yourself to His

sovereign purposes, you have turned prayer into paganism." Baucham draws a direct line from the prosperity gospel back to the wilderness temptation: in both cases, the creature demands that the Creator restructure the material world to serve the creature's desires.[7]

Voddie Baucham artikuluje tutón princip w konteksće teologije prosperity (Blahobytnosće), kotruž wón jako modernu institucializaciju prěnjeho pokušenja wobhladuje. Baucham warnuje, zo hibanje „mjenuj to a wobsydń to" zasadnje přirodnosć modlitwy njerozumi, hdyž z Bohom jako kosmiskim awtomatom wobchadźa. „Hdyž twoje modlitwowe žiwjenje wo tym je, Boha k změnjenju twojich wobstejnosćow přimjeć, město zo by so Jeho suwerenym zaměram poddało, sy modlitwu do pohanstwa přeměnił." Baucham ćehnje direktnu liniju wot ewangelija blahobytnosće wróćo k pusćinowemu pokušenju: w woběmaj padomaj žada stworjenje, zo by Stwórc materijalny swět přestrukturował, zo by žadosćam stworjenja służił.[7:1]

沃迪·鮑肯（Voddie Baucham）在成功神學的語境下闡述了這一原則，他將成功神學視為第一重試探的現代制度化。鮑肯警告，「宣告即得著」運動從根本上誤解了禱告的本質，將上帝視為一台宇宙自動販賣機。「當你的禱告生活是關於讓上帝改變你的處境，而非關於將自己降服於祂至高的旨意時，你就已經把禱告變成了異教。」鮑肯從成功福音直接追溯到曠野試探：在兩種情形下，受造物都要求造物主重構物質世界，以服事受造物的慾望。[7:2]

Ray Comfort, known for his evangelistic street preaching and apologetics, echoes this diagnosis in characteristically blunt fashion. Comfort frequently points out that the god many people pray to is not the God of Scripture but a domesticated idol shaped by their own desires. "People want a god who will give them what they want when they want it. That's not the God of the Bible. That's a genie in a lamp." For Comfort, the first temptation illustrates the perennial human tendency to reduce God to a provider of material comfort — a tendency that makes prayer not an act of worship but an act of consumption.[8]

Ray Comfort, znaty za swoje ewangelizaciske dróhowe prědowanje a apologetiku, tute diagnozy w swojim charakteristiskim direktnym wašnju wothłosuje. Comfort často podšmórni, zo bóh, ke kotremuž so wjele ludźi modli, njeje Bóh Swjateho pisma, ale domjacny idol, kotryž je po jich žadosćach formowany. „Ludźo chcedźa boha, kotryž jim da, štož chcedźa, hdyž chcedźa. To njeje Bóh Biblije. To je duch w lampje." Za Comforta prěnje pokušenje wěčnu człowjesku tendencu ilustruje, Boha na zastararja materialneho komforta redukować — tendenca, kotraž modlitwu nic z akta česćowanja, ale z akta konsumpcije čini.[8:1]

雷·乾福德（Ray Comfort）以其一貫直率的風格呼應了這一診斷，他以街頭佈道和護教學而聞名。乾福德經常指出，許多人禱告的對象並非聖經中的上帝，而是一個按照自己慾望塑造的被馴化的偶像。「人們想要一個在他們想要的時候給他們想要之物的神。那不是聖經的上帝。那是一盞燈裡的精靈。」對乾福德而言，第一重試探說明了人類將上帝降格為物質舒適之供應者的永恆傾向——這種傾向使禱告不再是敬拜之舉，而成為消費之行。[8:2]

Bishop Robert Barron brings the Catholic sacramental tradition to bear on this temptation. Barron identifies the first temptation as the reduction of all reality to the material — what he calls "metaphysical materialism disguised as prayer." When we pray only for material transformation — *give me this, change that, fix my circumstances* — we treat God as though He were merely a more powerful version of the material forces we wish to control. Barron writes: "The first temptation is always the temptation to reduce the spiritual to the material, to make God a means to worldly ends. Jesus' response — 'man shall not live on bread alone' — is a reassertion of the primacy of the spiritual over the material."[9]

Biskop Robert Barron přinjese katolsku sakramentalnu tradiciju k tutomu pokušenju. Barron identifikuje prěnje pokušenje jako redukuju wšeje reality na materialne — štož wón „metafyziski materializm, zdrasćeny jako modlitwa" mjenuje. Hdyž so jeno za materialnu přeměnu modlimy — *daj mi to, změń tamne, porjedź moje wobstejnosće* —

wobchadźamy z Bohom, jako by wón jenož mócniša werzija materijalnych mocow był, kotrež chcemy kontrolować. Barron piše: „Prěnje pokušenje je přeco pokušenje, duchowne na materijalne redukować, z Boha srědk k swětnym ciljam činić. Jězusowa wotmołwa — ‚człowjek njeje žiwy wot chlěba samoho' — je znowapotwjerdźenje prěnjosće duchowneho nad materijalnym."[9:1]

巴倫主教（Bishop Robert Barron）將天主教的聖事傳統引入對這一試探的分析。巴倫將第一重試探辨識為將一切現實簡化為物質層面——他稱之為「偽裝成禱告的形而上學唯物主義」。當我們只為物質性的轉變禱告——給我這個，改變那個，修復我的處境——我們便將上帝視為我們渴望控制之物質力量的一個更強大版本。巴倫寫道：「第一重試探永遠是將屬靈之事簡化為物質之事的試探，是使上帝成為達成世俗目的之手段的試探。耶穌的回應——『人活著不是單靠食物』——是對屬靈之事高於物質之事之優先性的重新宣告。」[9:2]

Dr. Michael S. Heiser, whose work on the divine council and the supernatural worldview of the Bible has profoundly shaped contemporary evangelical scholarship, provides an important angelological context. Heiser notes that the temptation scenes must be understood against the backdrop of the cosmic war between Yahweh and the rebellious elohim — the spiritual beings who have usurped authority over the nations (Deuteronomy 32:8–9; Psalm 82). For Heiser, Satan's offer to Jesus is an attempt to recruit the Son of God into the same pattern of rebellion that characterizes the fallen divine beings: using supernatural power for self-interest rather than in obedience to the Most High. Prayer that follows this pattern — using spiritual power (or requesting that God use His power) for self-serving ends — participates in the very rebellion that the temptation narrative condemns.[10]

Dr. Michael S. Heiser, čijež dźěło wo božanskej radźe a nadpřirodnym swětowym nahladźe Biblije je hłuboko sučasne ewangelske slědźenje formowało, poskićuje ważny angelologiski kontekst. Heiser podšmórni, zo sceny pokušenja dyrbja so přećiwo pozadkej kosmiskeje wójny mjez Jahwu a zběžnymi Elohim — duchownymi bytosćemi,

kotrež su sej awtoritu nad narodami přiwłastnili (5. Kniha Mojzesowa 32,8–9; Psalm 82) — rozumjeć. Za Heisera je Satanowa poskitka Jězusej pospyt, Syna Božeho do sameho musta zběžka rekrutować, kotraž padnjene božanske bytosće charakterizuje: nadpřirodnu móc za sebjewosobny zajim wužiwać, město w posłušnosći k Najwyšemu. Modlitwa, kotraž tutomu mustrej slěduje — duchownu móc wužiwać (abo žadać, zo by Bóh swoju móc wužiwał) za sebjesłužne zaměry — participuje na samsnej zběžce, kotruž naratiwa pokušenja zasudźuje.[10:1]

邁可·乃希瑟博士（Dr. Michael S. Heiser）的研究——關於神聖會議及聖經的超自然世界觀——深刻地塑造了當代福音派學術，他為此提供了重要的天使學背景。乃希瑟指出，試探的場景必須在耶和華與悖逆的「以羅欣」（elohim）——即那些僭取了對列國之權柄的靈體（申命記32:8-9；詩篇82篇）——之間宇宙戰爭的背景下來理解。對乃希瑟而言，撒但向耶穌的提議是一個將上帝之子招募進入墮落的神聖存有所表現的同一悖逆模式的企圖：將超自然能力用於自我利益，而非順從至高者。遵循這一模式的禱告——使用屬靈能力（或要求上帝使用祂的能力）來達成自我服事的目的——正是參與了試探敘事所譴責的那場悖逆。[10:2]

Cliffe Knechtle, in his campus apologetics ministry, frequently addresses the question of why God does not simply give people what they pray for. Knechtle argues that if God automatically transformed reality to match every human desire expressed in prayer, He would not be a loving Father but an enabler of spiritual immaturity. "A good parent doesn't give a child everything the child screams for. God is forming us, shaping us, and that process often requires that we don't get what we want."[11]

Cliffe Knechtle w swojej campus-apologetiskej służbje často prašenje adresuje, čehodla Bóh ludźom prosće njedawa, wo čož so modla. Knechtle twjerdźi, zo by Bóh, by-li wón realitu awtomatisce po kóždej človjeskej žadosći, kotraž bu w modlitwje wuprajena, přeměnił, nic lubowavy Wótc był, ale spěchowaŕ duchowneje njezralnosće. „Dobry staršej njeda dźěsću wšitko, za čož dźěćo křiči. Bóh nas formuje, nas tworja, a tón proces často žada, zo njedóstanjemy, štož chcemy."[11:1]

克利夫·內克特爾（Cliffe Knechtle）在其校園護教事工中，經常回應一個問題：為何上帝不直接給人們所禱告的。內克特爾論證，若上帝自動將現實轉變以匹配禱告中表達的每一個人類慾望，祂便不是一位慈愛的父親，而是屬靈不成熟的縱容者。「一個好父母不會給孩子所有孩子哭鬧要求的東西。上帝在塑造我們、陶冶我們，而那個過程往往要求我們得不到我們想要的。」[11:2]

Gary Hamrick, pastor of Cornerstone Chapel, in his verse-by-verse exposition of Matthew, identifies the first temptation as Satan's attempt to get Jesus to meet a legitimate need through an illegitimate means. Hamrick emphasizes that hunger is not sinful — the sin lies in demanding that God satisfy our needs on our timetable and through our preferred methods. "God doesn't mind that we bring our hunger to Him. What He minds is when we dictate how He should feed us."[12]

Gary Hamrick, farař Cornerstone Chapel, identifikuje w swojim słowo-za-słowo wuswětlenju Mateja prěnje pokušenje jako Satanowy pospyt, Jězusa k tomu přiwjesć, zo by legitimnu potrjebu přez njelegitimny srědk spokojił. Hamrick podšmórni, zo hłód njeje hrěšny — hrěch leži w žadanju, zo by Bóh naše potrjeby po našim časowym planje a přez naše preferowane metody spokojił. „Bohu njewadźi, zo jemu naš hłód přinjasemy. Štož jemu wadźi, je, hdyž jemu předpisamy, kak by nas živić dyrbjał."[12:1]

蓋瑞·哈姆里克（**Gary Hamrick**），基石教堂（Cornerstone Chapel）的牧師，在其逐節闡釋馬太福音時，將第一重試探辨識為撒但試圖讓耶穌通過不合法的途徑來滿足一個合法的需要。哈姆里克強調，飢餓本身並非罪——罪在於要求上帝按照我們的時間表、通過我們偏好的方式來滿足我們的需求。「上帝不介意我們將飢餓帶到祂面前。祂介意的是我們指定祂應當如何餵養我們。」[12:2]

Dr. Chuck Missler, in his characteristically technical and information-rich approach to Scripture, notes that the wilderness temptation must be understood in light of the *typological* relationship between Jesus and Israel. Just as Israel was tested in the

wilderness for forty years and failed by demanding bread (Numbers 11:4–6), Jesus endured forty days and succeeded by refusing to demand it. For Missler, the lesson is clear: "The moment you start telling God what He ought to do with His own creation, you have left the domain of prayer and entered the domain of presumption."[13]

Dr. Chuck Missler w swojim charakteristiskim techniskim a informacijach bohaty přistupu k Swjatemu pismu podšmórni, zo pusćinowe pokušenje so w swětle *typologiskeho* poćaha mjez Jězusom a Israelom rozumjeć dyrbi. Runje tak, kaž Israel bu w pusćinje za štyrceći lět testowany a zwrěšći, dokelž žadaše chlěb (4. Kniha Mojzesowa 11,4–6), Jězus štyrceći dnjow znjeseše a wuspěšny bu, dokelž wotpokaza, jón žadać. Za Misslera je lekcija jasna: „Tón wokomik, hdyž Bohu započinješ prajić, štož by wón ze swojim swójskim stworjenjom dyrbjał činić, sy wobwod modlitwy wopušćił a do wobwoda přetrjebnosće zastupił."[13:1]

乾查克·乃密瑟博士（Dr. Chuck Missler）以其一貫的技術性和信息豐富的聖經研究方式指出，曠野試探必須在耶穌與以色列之間的預表學關係之光中來理解。正如以色列在曠野被試驗四十年，卻因要求餅而失敗（民數記11:4-6），耶穌忍受了四十天而成功，因為祂拒絕去要求。對密瑟而言，功課是清楚的：「當你開始告訴上帝，祂該如何處理祂自己的創造之時，你就已經離開了禱告的範疇，進入了僭越的範疇。」[13:2]

William Lane Craig, the preeminent Christian philosopher and apologist, frames the first temptation in terms of *divine aseity* — God's self-sufficiency and independence. Craig argues that prayer which demands God restructure reality reflects a failure to grasp that God's providential ordering of the world already reflects His perfect wisdom. "To demand that God change the basic facts of reality is implicitly to claim that one's own judgment about what reality ought to look like is superior to God's — and that is the very definition of hubris."[14]

William Lane Craig, wybitny křesćanski filozofa a apologet, rámuje prěnje pokušenje w terminach *božskeje aseity* — Božeje samodostatnosće a njewotwisnosće. Craig twjerdźi, zo modlitwa, kotraž žada, zo by Bóh realitu přestrukturował, wotbłyšćuje njedostatk zrozumjenja, zo Bože zastaranskeho porjadowanje swěta hižo Jeho dospołnu mudrosć wotbłyšćuje. „Žadać, zo by Bóh zakładne fakty reality změnił, je implicitnje twjerdźić, zo swójski sudźenje wo tym, kak realita wupadać dyrbjała, je wyše hač Bože — a to je sama definicija hubris."[14:1]

威廉·萊恩·乃克雷（**William Lane Craig**），傑出的基督教哲學家和護教學家，以神聖自存性（divine aseity）——即上帝的自足性和獨立性——的概念框架來闡釋第一重試探。乃克雷論證，要求上帝重構現實的禱告反映出未能把握上帝對世界的護理性安排已然反映了祂完美的智慧。「要求上帝改變現實的基本事實，隱含地聲稱自己對現實應該如何的判斷高於上帝的判斷——而這正是傲慢的定義。」[14:2]

Dr. Craig Keener, whose monumental commentary work on the New Testament provides exhaustive historical-cultural context, notes that in the first-century Jewish context, the demand for bread echoed the generation of the wilderness who "tested" God by demanding provision on their own terms (Psalm 78:18–20). Keener observes that the Hebrew concept of "testing God" (*nassah*) carried the connotation not merely of doubt but of placing conditions on God's faithfulness — essentially saying, *"I will believe you are God only if you do what I want."* This is the grammar of the first temptation, and it is the grammar of every prayer that demands God prove Himself by rearranging reality.[15]

Dr. Craig Keener, čijež monumentalne komentarne dźěło k Nowemu Zakonjej wobšěrny historiski-kulturny kontekst podawa, podšmórni, zo w prěnjolětstotnym židowskim konteksće žadanje za chlěbom heneraciju pusćiny wothłosowaše, kotraž Boha „testaše", žadajo zastaranje po swojich swójskich wuměnjenjach (Psalm 78,18–20). Keener wobkedźbuje, zo hebrejski koncept „testowanja Boha" (*nassah*)

konotaciju nic jenož dwěla, ale stajeneje wuměnjenjow na Božu wěrnosć wopřijimaše — esencielnje prajiło: *„Budu wěrić, zo sy Bóh, jenož hdyž činiš, štož chcu."* To je gramatika prěnjeho pokušenja, a je to gramatika kóždeje modlitwy, kotraž žada, zo by Bóh sebi sameho dopokazał přez přeporjadowanje reality.[15:1]

克雷格·基納博士（Dr. Craig Keener）的紀念碑式新約註釋提供了詳盡的歷史文化背景。他指出，在第一世紀的猶太語境中，對餅的要求呼應了曠野中那一代人「試探」上帝、要求上帝按照他們自己的條件供應的行為（詩篇78:18-20）。基納觀察到，希伯來文「試探上帝」（*nassah*）的概念所蘊含的不僅是懷疑，更是對上帝的信實設定條件——本質上就是在說：*「唯有祢做了我想要的事，我才相信祢是上帝。」*這是第一重試探的語法，也是每一種要求上帝藉重新安排現實來證明自己的禱告的語法。[15:2]

Robby Gallaty, pastor and founder of Replicate Ministries, connects the first temptation to the discipline of fasting and the spiritual danger of impatience. Gallaty teaches that fasting is a voluntary embrace of deprivation in order to sharpen dependence on God — and the temptation to "turn stones into bread" is the temptation to end the spiritual discipline prematurely because the cost has become uncomfortable. "Every time we short-circuit what God is doing in the desert season because we're tired of waiting, we're turning stones into bread."[16]

Robby Gallaty, farař a założer Replicate Ministries, zwjazuje prěnje pokušenje z disciplinu postowanja a z duchownym strachom njescerpliwosće. Gallaty wuči, zo postowanje je dobrowólne přijimanje njedostatka, zo by so wotwisnosć wot Boha wótřiła — a pokušenje, „kamjenje do chlěba přeměnić", je pokušenje, duchownu disciplinu předčasnje zakónčić, dokelž je kóšt njepřijomny stał. „Kóždy raz, hdyž to, štož Bóh w pusćinowej sezonje čini, předčasnje přetorhnjemy, dokelž smy wočakowanje wustali, přeměnjamy kamjenje do chlěba."[16:1]

羅比·加拉提（**Robby Gallaty**），牧師兼「複製事工」（Replicate Ministries）創辦人，將第一重試探與禁食的操練及不耐煩的屬靈危險聯繫起來。加拉提教導，禁食是自願擁抱匱乏，以磨礪對上帝的倚靠——而「將石頭變成餅」的試探，就是因為代價已變得令人不適而過早結束屬靈操練的試探。「每當我們因為厭倦等待而短路了上帝在曠野季節中所做的工作，我們就是在將石頭變成餅。」[16:2]

Fr. Chad Ripperger, the prominent Catholic exorcist and Thomistic theologian, provides an incisive demonological perspective. Ripperger teaches that demonic temptation characteristically operates by presenting a *legitimate good* (food, safety, authority) through an *illegitimate means* — thereby corrupting the will without appearing to corrupt the desire itself. The first temptation follows this pattern precisely: bread is good, hunger is real, but the means proposed — commanding divine power to serve personal appetite — inverts the proper ordering of the creature to the Creator. Ripperger warns that many prayers, even those offered sincerely, contain this same inversion: "When you pray for God to change your circumstances rather than asking Him to change *you*, you may be cooperating with the very strategy the devil used against Christ."[17]

Farař Chad Ripperger, wuznamny katolski exorcist a tomistiski teolog, poskićuje wótry demonologiski perspektiw. Ripperger wuči, zo demoniske pokušenje charakteristisce přez předstajeneje *legitimneho dobra* (jědź, wěstota, awtority) přez *njelegitimne srědki* funguje — přez to wolu korumpujo, bjez toho zo by žadosć samu korumpował. Prěnje pokušenje tutomu mustrej dokładnje slěduje: chlěb je dobry, hłód je woprawdźity, ale namjetowane srědki — božsku móc přikazać, zo by wosobnemu ćěłnemu žadanju służiła — prawy porjadk stworjenja ke Stwórcej přewobroća. Ripperger warnuje, zo mnohe modlitwy, samo te, kotrež su wěrnje poskićene, samsnu inwerziju wobsahuja: „Hdyž so modliš, zo by Bóh twoje wobstejnosće změnił, město zo by jeho prosył, *tebje*

změnić, móžeš z tej samej strategiju kooperować, kotraž je djaboł přećiwo Chrystusej wužiwał."[17:1]

里柏傑神父（**Fr. Chad Ripperger**），著名的天主教驅魔師和多瑪斯主義神學家，提供了一個銳利的魔鬼學視角。里柏傑教導，魔鬼的試探其特徵性的運作方式是通過不合法的途徑呈現一個合法的善（食物、安全、權柄）——從而在不似乎腐化慾望本身的情況下腐化意志。第一重試探精確地遵循了這一模式：餅是好的，飢餓是真實的，但所提議的途徑——命令神聖的能力服事個人的食慾——顛倒了受造物對造物主的正當秩序。里柏傑警告，許多禱告，即使是真誠獻上的，也包含同樣的顛倒：「當你禱告上帝改變你的處境，而非求祂改變你的時候，你可能正在配合魔鬼用來對付基督的那同一策略。」[17:2]

Dr. John Bergsma, Catholic biblical scholar and theologian, enriches the discussion by noting the eucharistic typology present in the first temptation. Bergsma observes that Jesus' refusal to turn stones into bread anticipates the multiplication of loaves (Matthew 14:13–21), where bread is provided *by the Father's initiative and through the Son's obedience*, not through autonomous self-provision. The pattern is clear: God does provide bread — but on His terms, in His time, and through channels of obedience, not through the creature's imperious demand.[18]

Dr. John Bergsma, katolski bibliski wědomostnik a teolog, wobogatća diskusiju přez podšmórnjenitwarje eucharistiskeje typologije w prěnim pokušenju. Bergsma wobkedźbuje, zo Jězusowe wotpokazanje, kamjenje do chlěba přeměnić, rozmnoženje chlěbow (Matej 14,13–21) antecipuje, hdźež so chlěb *přez iniciatiwu Wótca a přez posłušnosć Syna* podawa, nic přez awtonomne samozastaranje. Mustr je jasny: Bóh chlěb podawa — ale po swojich wuměnjenjach, w swojim času a přez kanale posłušnosće, nic přez despotiske žadanje stworjenja.[18:1]

約翰·柏格斯馬博士（**Dr. John Bergsma**），天主教聖經學者及神學家，通過指出第一重試探中存在的聖體預表學來豐富討論。柏格斯馬觀察到，耶穌拒絕將石頭變成餅預示了五餅

二魚的神蹟（馬太福音14:13-21），在那裡餅是藉天父的主動和聖子的順服而供應的，而非透過自主的自我供給。模式是清晰的：上帝確實供應餅——但是按祂的條件、在祂的時間、透過順服的管道，而非透過受造物專橫的要求。[18:2]

Nate Sala, apologist and founder of Every Thought Captive, highlights the epistemological dimension: Satan's challenge "If you are the Son of God" is designed to make Jesus prove His identity through action rather than resting in the Father's declaration at His baptism (Matthew 3:17). Sala draws the parallel to prayer: "When we pray demanding that God prove Himself to us by giving us what we want, we are doing what Satan asked Jesus to do — testing God's identity by demanding evidence on our own terms."[19]

Nate Sala, apologet a założer Every Thought Captive, wuzběhnje epistemologisku dimenziju: Satanowe wužadanje „Sy-li Syn Boži" je projektowane, zo by Jězusa přinuźiło, swoju identitu přez jednanje dopokazać, město zo by so na wozjewjenje Wótca při swojim wukřćenju (Matej 3,17) spušćił. Sala paralelu k modlitwje ćehnje: „Hdyž so modlimy, žadajo, zo by Bóh so nam dopokazał, dawši nam, štož chcemy, činimy to, štož Satan Jězusa činić prosy — Božu identitu testować přez žadanje dopokaza po našich swójskich wuměnjenjach."[19:1]

內特·薩拉（**Nate Sala**），護教學家兼「使每個意念被擄」（Every Thought Captive）事工創辦人，突出了認識論的維度：撒但的挑戰「你若是神的兒子」旨在讓耶穌通過行動來證明自己的身份，而非安息在天父於祂受洗時的宣告之中（馬太福音3:17）。薩拉以此類比禱告：「當我們禱告要求上帝藉著給我們想要的來向我們證明祂自己時，我們就是在做撒但要耶穌做的事——按照我們自己的條件要求證據來試驗上帝的身份。」[19:2]

Daniel Maritz (DLM Christian Lifestyle), in his popular YouTube ministry, connects the first temptation to the modern culture of instant gratification and the erosion of patience in prayer. Maritz teaches that the digital age has conditioned believers to expect

immediate results — even from God — and that this expectation is itself a form of the first temptation: demanding that God transform reality instantly to match our desires. "We've turned prayer into Amazon Prime. We want God to deliver in two days or less."[20]

Daniel Maritz (DLM Christian Lifestyle) w swojej popularnej YouTube-służbje zwjazuje prěnje pokušenje z modernej kulturu bjezposrědnjeho spokojenja a eroziju scerpliwosće w modlitwje. Maritz wuči, zo digitalny čas wěriwych wučahował, zo by wočakowali bjezposrědnje wuslědki — samo wot Boha — a zo tute wočakowanje same forma prěnjeho pokušenja je: žadać, zo by Bóh realitu hnydom přeměnił, zo by našim žadosćam wotpowědowała. „Smy modlitwu do Amazon Prime přeměnili. Chcemy, zo Bóh we dwěmaj dnjomaj abo mjenej dodawa."[20:1]

丹尼爾·馬瑞茲（Daniel Maritz, DLM Christian Lifestyle）在其廣受歡迎的YouTube事工中，將第一重試探與當代即時滿足文化及禱告中耐心的侵蝕聯繫起來。馬瑞茲教導，數位時代已經制約信徒期待即時的結果——甚至是從上帝那裡——而這種期待本身就是第一重試探的一種形式：要求上帝即時轉變現實以匹配我們的慾望。「我們已經把禱告變成了亞馬遜Prime快遞。我們要上帝在兩天或更短時間內送達。」[20:2]

Vlad Savchuk, pastor and author, in his teaching on spiritual warfare and prayer, emphasizes that the first temptation reveals the danger of seeking God's *hand* rather than God's *face*. Savchuk teaches: "Too many believers pray to God's hand — they want what He can give them. The mature believer prays to God's face — they want Him. When you're more focused on what God can do for you than on who God is, you've fallen into the first temptation."[21]

Vlad Savchuk, farař a awtor, we wučenju wo duchownym wojowanju a modlitwje, podšmórni, zo prěnje pokušenje strach wozjewja, Božu *ruku* město Božeho *wobliča* pytać. Savchuk wuči: „Přewjele wěriwych so k Božej ruce modli — chcedźa, štož jim

dać móže. Zraly wěriwy so k Božemu wobliču modli — chcedźa Jeho. Hdyž so bóle na to koncentruješ, štož Bóh za tebje činić móže, hač na to, štó Bóh je, sy do prěnjeho pokušenja padnył."[21:1]

弗拉德·薩夫丘克（**Vlad Savchuk**），牧師兼作家，在其關於屬靈爭戰與禱告的教導中，強調第一重試探揭示了尋求上帝的手而非上帝的面的危險。薩夫丘克教導：「太多信徒向上帝的手禱告——他們想要祂所能給予的。成熟的信徒向上帝的面禱告——他們想要祂本身。當你更專注於上帝能為你做什麼，而非上帝是誰的時候，你就已經陷入了第一重試探。」[21:2]

Dr. Karlo Broussard, Catholic apologist, provides a philosophical dimension rooted in Thomistic metaphysics. Broussard notes that the first temptation is essentially a violation of the *principle of finality*: every created thing has a God-ordained end (*telos*), and to demand that God change the *telos* of stones (which exist as inorganic mineral matter) into the *telos* of bread (which exists as nourishment) merely to serve human appetite is to claim authority over the Creator's design. In prayer, this manifests as "telling God what His creation should be for, rather than asking God what *we* should be for."[22]

Dr. Karlo Broussard, katolski apologet, poskićuje filozofisku dimenziju, kotraž je w tomistiskej metafyzice zakorjenjena. Broussard podšmórni, zo prěnje pokušenje je esencielnje ranjenje *principa finalnosće*: kóžda stworjena wěc ma Bohom postajeny cil (*telos*), a žadać, zo by Bóh *telos* kamjenjow (kotrež jako anorganiska mineralska materija eksistuja) do *telos* chlěba (kotryž jako zežiwjenje eksistuje) změnił, jenož zo by człowjeskemu ćěłnemu žadanju służił, rěka sej awtoritu nad Stwórcowym designom přiswojić. W modlitwje so to manifestuje jako „Bohu prajić, za čo by jeho stworjenje dyrbjało być, město zo by Boha prašał, za čo *my* dyrbjeli być."[22:1]

卡洛·布魯薩爾博士（**Dr. Karlo Broussard**），天主教護教學家，提供了植根於多瑪斯主義形而上學的哲學維度。布魯薩爾指出，第一重試探本質上是對目的因原則的違犯：每一受造

之物都有上帝所命定的目的（*telos*），而要求上帝將石頭的目的（作為無機礦物質而存在）改變為餅的目的（作為養料而存在），僅僅為了服事人類的食慾，就是僭取對造物主設計的權柄。在禱告中，這表現為「告訴上帝祂的創造應該為何目的而存在，而非詢問上帝我們應該為何目的而存在。」[22:2]

Jesus' response — "Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God" (Matthew 4:4, citing Deuteronomy 8:3) — is the definitive correction. The creature's life is not sustained by the manipulation of material reality but by **receptive dependence on the Word of God**. Authentic prayer, therefore, does not demand that God change our reality; it asks that God change *us* to receive His reality.

Jězusowa wotmołwa — „Čłowjek njeje žiwy wot chlěba samoho, ale wot kóždeho słowa, kotrež z rta Božeho wuchadźa" (Matej 4,4, cituje Deuteronomium 8,3) — je definitiwna korekcija. Žiwjenje stworjenja njebudźe přez manipulaciju materijalneje reality zežiwjene, ale přez **přijimowatu wotwisnosć wot Słowa Božeho**. Awtentiska modlitwa tohodla nježada, zo by Bóh našu realitu změnił; prosy, zo by Bóh *nas* změnił, zo bychmy jeho realitu přijeli.

耶穌的回應——「人活著，不是單靠食物，乃是靠神口裡所出的一切話」（馬太福音4:4，引用申命記8:3）——是決定性的糾正。受造物的生命不是靠對物質現實的操縱來維持，而是靠對上帝話語的領受性倚靠。因此，真正的禱告不是要求上帝改變我們的現實；而是祈求上帝改變我們，使我們能領受祂的現實。

III. The Second Temptation: Throwing Oneself from the Temple — The Prayer That Demands God Rescue Us from Our Own Folly

Druhe pokušenje: Sebi ze templa ćisnyć — Modlitwa, kotraž žada, zo by nas Bóh z našeje swójskeje hłuposće wumóžił

第二重試探：從殿頂跳下——要求上帝從我們自己的愚蠢中拯救我們的禱告

A. The Biblical Text | Biblijski tekst | 經文

Matthew 4:5–7 — "Then the devil took him to the holy city and had him stand on the highest point of the temple. 'If you are the Son of God,' he said, 'throw yourself down. For it is written: He will command his angels concerning you, and they will lift you up in their hands, so that you will not strike your foot against a stone.' Jesus answered him, 'It is also written: Do not put the Lord your God to the test.'" (cf. Deuteronomy 6:16; Psalm 91:11–12)

Matej 4,5–7 — „Tehdy wzja jeho djaboł sobu do swjateho města a postaji jeho na najwyšši dypk templa. ‚Sy-li Syn Boži', rjekny, ‚ćisń so dele. Přetož pisane steji: Wón přikaza swojim jandźelam wo tebje, a na rukach budu tebje nosyć, zo njezrazyrońkiw swój wo kamjeń.' Jězus jemu wotmołwi: ‚Też je pisane: Njespytuj Knjeza, swojeho Boha.'" (hlej Deuteronomium 6,16; Psalm 91,11–12)

馬太福音4:5-7 —「魔鬼就帶他進了聖城，叫他站在殿頂上，對他說：『你若是神的兒子，可以跳下去，因為經上記著說：主要為你吩咐他的使者用手托著你，免得你的腳碰在石頭上。』耶穌對他說：『經上又記著說：不可試探主你的上帝。』」（參申命記6:16；詩篇91:11-12）

B. The Logic of Manufactured Crisis | Logika wuhotowaneje krizy | 人為製造危機的邏輯

The second temptation is structurally distinct from the first. Where the first temptation asked Jesus to change reality to avoid suffering, the second asks Him to **create a crisis**

and then demand that God intervene. This is a more sophisticated form of blasphemous prayer, because it wraps presumption in the language of Scripture itself.

Druhe pokušenje je strukturelnje wot prěnjeho wotróznite. Hdźež prěnje pokušenje Jězusa prosyšezo bychu realitu změnił, zo by ćerpjenje wobešoł, druhe jeho prosy, zo by **krizy tworił a potom žadał, zo by Bóh zakročił**. To je sofistikowanišad forma blasfemiskeje modlitwy, dokelž přetrjebnosć do rěče samoho Swjateho pisma zawija.

第二重試探在結構上與第一重截然不同。第一重試探要求耶穌改變現實以避免苦難，而第二重要求祂製造一場危機，然後要求上帝介入。這是一種更為精巧的褻瀆性禱告形式，因為它將僭越包裹在聖經本身的語言之中。

Notice Satan's strategy: he *quotes Scripture* (Psalm 91:11–12). The implication is devastating in its subtlety: *"God promised to protect you. So create a situation that requires His protection, and see if He keeps His word."* This is the prayer of manufactured emergency — the believer who makes reckless, foolish, or sinful choices and then demands that God clean up the mess, citing His promises of protection and provision.

Wobkedźbujće Satanowu strategiju: wón *Swjate pismo cituje* (Psalm 91,11–12). Implikacija je w swojej subtilnosći zničowaca: *„Bóh slubiše, zo tebje škita. Potajkim wutworjej situaciju, kotraž jeho škit trjeba, a hlej, hač swoje słowo dźerži."* To je modlitwa wuhotowaneje nuznosće — wěriwy, kotryž lochkomyslne, hłupe abo hrěšne wólby čini a potom žada, zo by Bóh njeporjadk porjedźił, citowawši jeho slubjenja škita a zastaranja.

注意撒但的策略：他引用聖經（詩篇91:11-12）。其暗示以其精妙而具毀滅性：*「上帝應許保護你。那就製造一個需要祂保護的處境，看看祂是否信守祂的話。」*這是人為製造緊急狀況的禱告——信徒做出莽撞、愚蠢或有罪的選擇，然後引用上帝保護和供應的應許，要求上帝來收拾殘局。

Charles Spurgeon addressed this pattern with his characteristic directness: "God has promised to keep you in all your ways — but He has not promised to keep you in all your follies. The man who casts himself from the pinnacle of presumption has no right to claim the angels of providence." Spurgeon distinguished sharply between the believer who finds himself in danger through faithful obedience (for whom God's promises of protection are legitimately invoked) and the believer who manufactures danger through disobedience and then demands rescue.[23]

Charles Spurgeon adresowaše tutón mustr ze swojej charakteristiskej direktnosću: „Bóh je slubił, tebje na wšěch twojich pućach wobarnować — ale njeje slubił, tebje we wšěch twojich hłuposćach wobarnować. Muž, kotryž so z wjerška přetrjebnosće ćisnje, nima prawo, jandźelow zastaranja žadać." Spurgeon wótře rozeznawa mjez wěriwym, kotryž so přez wěrnu posłušnosć w straše namakaje (za kotrehož so Bože slubjenja škita legitimnje wužiwaja) a wěriwym, kotryž přez njeposłušnosć strach wuhotuje a potom wumóženje žada.[23:1]

司布真以其特有的直率回應了這一模式：「上帝應許在你一切的道路上保護你——但祂沒有應許在你一切的愚行中保護你。那從僭越之巔把自己拋下去的人，無權聲稱護理的天使。」司布真嚴格區分了那些因忠心順服而陷入危險的信徒（對他們而言，上帝保護的應許可被合法地援引），與那些因不順服而製造危險然後要求拯救的信徒。[23:2]

Derek Prince elaborated on this distinction in his teaching on the proper use of God's promises. Prince taught that Psalm 91 is a "conditional covenant" — its protections are available to those who "dwell in the shelter of the Most High" (Psalm 91:1), that is, those whose lives are characterized by habitual obedience and trust. To deliberately place oneself in danger and then claim the promises is to violate the very condition upon which the promises rest. Prince warned: "You cannot live in rebellion and claim the promises of obedience. That is not faith; that is presumption, and presumption is a form of witchcraft."[24]

Derek Prince wobšěrnje tutón rozdźěl we wučenju wo prawym wužiwanju Božich slubjenbow wuswětli. Prince wučeše, zo Psalm 91 „kondicionalny zwjazk" je — jeho škity su tym k dispoziciji, kiž „bydla w škiće Najwyšeho" (Psalm 91,1), to rěka, tym, kotrychž žiwjenje so přez zwučene posłušnosć a dowěru wuznamjenja. Wědomje sebi do straha stajić a potom slubjenja žadać, rěka samu wuměnjenu ranjić, na kotrejž slubjenja wotpočuja. Prince warnjowaše: „Njemóžeš w zběžce žiwy być a slubjenja posłušnosće žadać. To njeje wěra; to je přetrjebnosć, a přetrjebnosć je forma wěšćerstwa."[24:1]

葉光明在其關於正確使用上帝應許的教導中詳述了這一區分。葉光明教導，詩篇九十一篇是一個「有條件的盟約」——其保護是提供給那些「住在至高者隱密處」（詩篇91:1）的人的，也就是那些生命以慣常的順服和信靠為特徵的人。故意將自己置於危險之中，然後聲稱這些應許，就是違反了應許所依賴的那個條件本身。葉光明警告：「你不能活在悖逆中卻聲稱順服的應許。那不是信心；那是僭越，而僭越是巫術的一種形式。」[24:2]

John MacArthur identifies the second temptation as the sin of *testing God* — a sin explicitly prohibited in Deuteronomy 6:16, which references Israel's rebellion at Massah (Exodus 17:1–7). MacArthur explains: "At Massah, Israel said, 'Is the Lord among us or not?' They created a crisis of faith by demanding that God prove His presence through miraculous intervention. The second temptation is the same sin: creating a situation that forces God to act, or else be accused of breaking His own promises." MacArthur warns that many Christians practice this form of testing God without recognizing it — entering into foolish business deals, toxic relationships, or reckless decisions, and then praying fervently for God to rescue them from the consequences.[25]

John MacArthur identifikuje druhe pokušenje jako hrěch *testowanja Boha* — hrěch, kotryž je eksplicitnje w Deuteronomiju 6,16 zakazany, kotrež so na Israelsku zběžku w Massah (2. Kniha Mojzesowa 17,1–7) poćahuje. MacArthur wuswětla: „W Massah Israel rjekny: ‚Je Knjez mjez nami abo nic?' Woni wěrnu krizy tworjachu, žadajo, zo by Bóh

swoju přitomnosć přez dźiwowe zakročenje dopokazał. Druhe pokušenje je samsny hrěch: situaciju tworić, kotraž Boha nuzuje jednać, abo hewak budźe wobskorženy, zo je swoje swójske slubjenja złamał." MacArthur warnuje, zo mnozy křesćenjo tutu formu testowanja Boha praktizuja, bjez toho zo bychu to spóznali — zapodawši so do hłupych wobchodnych wobdźělenjow, toksiskych poćahow abo lochkomyslnych rozsudy, a potom so horliwje k Bohu modla, zo by jich z naslědkow wumóžił.[25:1]

約翰·麥克乃瑟將第二重試探辨識為試探上帝之罪——一個在申命記6:16中被明確禁止的罪，該經文引述了以色列在瑪撒的悖逆（出埃及記17:1-7）。麥克乃瑟解釋道：「在瑪撒，以色列說：『耶和華是在我們中間不是？』他們要求上帝通過神蹟性的干預來證明祂的同在，從而製造了信仰危機。第二重試探是同樣的罪：製造一個迫使上帝行動的處境，否則就指控祂違背了自己的應許。」麥克乃瑟警告，許多基督徒在不自覺中實踐著這種形式的試探上帝——進入愚蠢的商業交易、有毒的關係或莽撞的決定，然後熱切地禱告求上帝從後果中拯救他們。[25:2]

N.T. Wright adds a crucial eschatological dimension. Wright observes that the pinnacle of the Temple was not merely a high place but the symbolic center of Israel's covenant relationship with God. For Jesus to throw Himself from the Temple would be to create a public spectacle — a forced theophany that would compel God to act visibly. Wright notes: "This is the temptation to force God's hand — to create a situation where God *must* act, or be seen to have failed. It is the deepest form of testing God, because it disguises manipulation as faith."[26]

N.T. Wright přidawa rozsudzacu eschatologisku dimenziju. Wright wobkedźbuje, zo wjeršk templa njebě jenož wysoke městno, ale symboliski centrum Israelskeje zwjazkoweje poćahnosće k Bohu. Za Jězusa, sebi ze templa ćisnyć, by rěkało zjawny spektakl tworić — wunuzenu teofaniju, kotraž by Boha nuzowała, widźomnje jednać. Wright podšmórni: „To je pokušenje, Božu ruku nuzować — situaciju tworić, hdźež Bóh

dyrbi jednać, abo budźe widźany, zo je zwrěščił. To je najhłubša forma testowanja Boha, dokelž manipulaciju jako wěru maskuje."[26:1]

湯姆·賴特添加了一個關鍵的末世論維度。賴特觀察到，聖殿的頂端不僅僅是一個高處，而是以色列與上帝之盟約關係的象徵中心。耶穌從聖殿上跳下去，就是製造一場公開的奇觀——一次迫使上帝可見地行動的神顯。賴特指出：「這是迫使上帝出手的試探——製造一個上帝必須行動、否則就被視為失敗的處境。這是試探上帝最深層的形式，因為它將操縱偽裝成信心。」[26:2]

Jordan Peterson observes from the psychological angle that the second temptation represents the archetype of what he calls "voluntary victimhood" — the deliberate creation of catastrophe in order to test whether the universe (or God) will rescue you. Peterson notes: "There are people who continually create chaos in their lives and then cry out to be saved. That's not a genuine cry for help; it's a power play. It's a way of testing the fundamental structure of reality — of saying, 'Let's see if meaning itself holds up when I do my worst.'"[27]

Jordan Peterson wobkedźbuje z psychologiskeho wida, zo druhe pokušenje archetip toho reprezentuje, štož wón „dobrowólne wopornistwo" mjenuje — wědomje tworjenje katastrofy, zo by testował, hač universum (abo Bóh) tebje wumóži. Peterson podšmórni: „Su ludźo, kiž w swojim žiwjenju stajnje chaos tworja a potom wołaja, zo bychu wumóženi byli. To njeje woprawdźite wołanje wo pomoc; to je hra mocy. To je puć, fundamentalnu strukturu reality testować — prajić: ‚Hlejmyž, hač zmysł sam přetraje, hdyž ja najhórše činju.'"[27:1]

喬丹·彼得森從心理學角度觀察到，第二重試探代表了他所稱的「自願的受害者」原型——故意製造災難，以試驗宇宙（或上帝）是否會拯救你。彼得森指出：「有些人不斷在自己的生活中製造混亂，然後呼求被拯救。那不是真正的求助；那是一種權力遊戲。那是一種試驗現實根本結構的方式——在說：『讓我們看看，當我做到最糟時，意義本身是否還站得住。』」[27:2]

Kenny Burchard, a Pentecostal-Charismatic theologian and apologist, brings an important corrective from within the charismatic tradition itself. Burchard cautions against what he terms "faith-presumption confusion" — the tendency within some charismatic circles to mistake reckless behavior for faith. Burchard writes: "True faith trusts God within the boundaries He has established. Presumption crosses those boundaries and demands that God cover for us. Jumping off the temple is not faith; it is a dare. And you don't dare God."[28]

Kenny Burchard, pentekostalsko-charismatski teolog a apologet, přinjase ważnu korekciju znutřka charismatiski tradicije sameje. Burchard warnuje před tym, štož wón „konfuzija wěry a přetrjebnosće" mjenuje — tendenca w někotrych charismatiskych kruhach, lochkomyslne zadźerženje za wěru měć. Burchard piše: „Woprawdźita wěra Bohu dowěrja znutřka hranic, kotrež je wón postajił. Přetrjebnosć tute hranicy překroča a žada, zo by Bóh nas zakrywał. Ze templa skočić njeje wěra; je to dare. A ty Bohu njesmjertnuješ."[28:1]

肯尼·伯查德（**Kenny Burchard**），五旬節-靈恩派神學家兼護教學家，從靈恩傳統內部帶來了一個重要的糾正。伯查德告誡所謂「信心與僭越的混淆」——在某些靈恩圈子中將莽撞行為誤認為信心的傾向。伯查德寫道：「真正的信心是在上帝所設立的界限之內信靠祂。僭越越過了那些界限，要求上帝為我們善後。從聖殿上跳下去不是信心；那是對上帝的挑釁。你不能向上帝挑釁。」[28:2]

Matt Mason (Lion of Fire Ministries) applies this insight to the contemporary prayer of believers who pray for healing while refusing to take medicine, or who pray for financial breakthrough while refusing to work, or who pray for relational restoration while refusing to repent. Mason teaches: "The second temptation is alive and well in the church today. Every time a believer makes a mess and then expects God to perform a miracle to clean it up, they are jumping off the temple and quoting Psalm 91 on the way down."[29]

Matt Mason (Lion of Fire Ministries) aplikuje tutón dohlad na sučasnu modlitwu wěriwych, kiž so za wustrowjenje modla, ale wotpokazuja, lěki brać, abo kiž so za financne přełamanje modla, ale wotpokazuja, dźěłać, abo kiž so za porjedźenje poćahow modla, ale wotpokazuja, so kajać. Mason wuči: „Druhe pokušenje je dźensa w cyrkwi žiwe a strowe. Kóždy raz, hdyž wěriwy njeporjadk twori a potom wočakuje, zo by Bóh dźiw činjił, zo by jón porjedźił, skakuja ze templa a cituja Psalm 91 na puću dele."[29:1]

馬特·梅森（Matt Mason, Lion of Fire Ministries）將這一洞見應用於當代信徒的禱告實踐——那些為醫治禱告卻拒絕吃藥的人，為經濟突破禱告卻拒絕工作的人，為關係修復禱告卻拒絕悔改的人。梅森教導：「第二重試探在今天的教會中依然活躍。每當信徒製造了混亂，然後期待上帝行神蹟來收拾，他們就是在從聖殿頂上跳下去，一邊墜落一邊引用詩篇九十一篇。」[29:2]

Fr. Chris Alar, the well-known Marian Father, in his teaching on divine mercy and the proper disposition of prayer, draws a crucial distinction between trusting in God's mercy and *presuming* upon it. Alar teaches that presumption — the assumption that God will always intervene to prevent the consequences of our choices — is one of the sins against the Holy Spirit identified in Catholic moral theology. "Trust in God's mercy says, 'Lord, I need you.' Presumption says, 'Lord, you owe me.' The difference between the two is the difference between Gethsemane and the pinnacle of the temple."[30]

Farař Chris Alar, znaty marjanski wótc, we wučenju wo božskej miłosći a prawej dispoziciji modlitwy, rozeznawa rozsudzacy rozdźěl mjez dowěru do Božeje miłosće a *přetrjebnosću* na nju. Alar wuči, zo přetrjebnosć — předstawba, zo Bóh přeco zakroči, zo by naslědki našich wólbow zablokował — jedyn z hrěchow přećiwo Swjatemu Duchej je, kotrež su w katolskej moralnej teologiji identifikowane. „Dowěra do Božeje miłosće praji: ‚Knježe, trjebam tebje.' Přetrjebnosć praji: ‚Knježe, ty mi dołžiš.' Rozdźěl mjez woběmaj je rozdźěl mjez Getsemane a wjerškom templa."[30:1]

阿拉爾神父（**Fr. Chris Alar**），著名的聖母升天會神父，在其關於神聖慈悲與禱告正確態度的教導中，劃出了信賴上帝的慈悲與僭越地仰賴慈悲之間的關鍵區分。阿拉爾教導，僭越——即假設上帝總會介入以阻止我們選擇之後果——是天主教道德神學中所辨認的干犯聖靈之罪之一。「信賴上帝的慈悲說：『主啊，我需要祢。』僭越說：『主啊，祢欠我的。』兩者之間的差別，就是客西馬尼園與聖殿頂之間的差別。」[30:2]

Fr. Donald Calloway, in his powerful conversion testimony and subsequent Marian teaching ministry, embodies this very lesson. Calloway recounts how in his years of rebellion, he repeatedly made disastrous choices and yet was preserved by grace — but he is careful to note that God's intervention was an act of *mercy*, not of *obligation*. Calloway teaches that the proper response to God's rescue from our foolishness is repentance and gratitude, not the assumption that God is required to keep rescuing us. "God saved me from myself, but He didn't owe me that. If I had kept jumping off pinnacles, eventually I would have hit the ground."[31]

Farař Donald Calloway w swojim mócznym nawrócenskim swědčenju a pozdźišej marjanskej wučbowej służbje tutu lekciju sam wotbłyšćuje. Calloway wopisuje, kak je w lětach swojeje zběžki wospjetnje katastrofalne wólby činjił a tola přez hnadu zachowany bu — ale je kedźbliwy podšmórnić, zo Bože zakročenje akt *miłosće* bě, nic *winowatosće*. Calloway wuči, zo prawje wotmołwjenje na Bože wumóženje z našeje hłuposće je pokuta a dźaknosć, nic předstawba, zo je Bóh winowaty, nas dale a dale wumóžeć. „Bóh mje přede mnu samym wumóži, ale njebě mi to dłužny. Bych-li dale z wjerškami skakał, bych naposledk do zemje zrazył."[31:1]

卡洛韋神父（Fr. Donald Calloway）以其有力的歸信見證和隨後的聖母論教導事工，親身體現了這一功課。卡洛韋敘述他在悖逆的歲月中如何反覆做出災難性的選擇，卻仍被恩典保守——但他仔細地指出，上帝的介入是憐憫之舉，而非義務。卡洛韋教導，對上帝從我們愚蠢中施行拯救的正確回應是悔改和感恩，而非假定上帝有義務持續拯救我們。「上帝從我自己手中救了我，但祂不欠我那個。如果我繼續從頂上跳下去，最終我會摔到地上。」[31:2]

Dave Armstrong, Catholic apologist and prolific author, notes that the second temptation reveals Satan's capacity to use Scripture deceptively — a warning Armstrong applies directly to the misuse of biblical promises in prayer. Armstrong observes: "Satan is the first proof-texter. He takes a genuine promise of God and strips it of its context, its conditions, and its proper application. Christians do the same thing every time they rip a promise out of its covenantal context and use it to justify their own reckless behavior."[32]

Dave Armstrong, katolski apologet a wobšěrny awtor, podšmórni, zo druhe pokušenje Satanowu kmadnosć wozjewja, Swjate pismo wobłudnisce wužiwać — warnowanje, kotrež Armstrong direktnje na znjewužiwanje biblijskich slubjenbow w modlitwje aplikuje. Armstrong wobkedźbuje: „Satan je prěni proof-texter (Tekstzwjesćeŕ). Wón wzme woprawdźite slubjenje Boha a wzeje jemu jeho kontekst, jeho wuměnjenja a jeho prawe nałožowanje. Křesćenjo činja to same kóždy raz, hdyž slubjenje z jeho zwjazkoweho konteksta wutorhuja a jón wužiwaja, zo bychu swoje swójske lochkomyslne zadźerženje wusprawotnili."[32:1]

戴夫·阿姆斯壯（**Dave Armstrong**），天主教護教學家兼多產作家，指出第二重試探揭示了撒但欺騙性地使用聖經的能力——阿姆斯壯將這一警告直接應用於禱告中對聖經應許的濫用。阿姆斯壯觀察道：「撒但是第一個斷章取義者。他拿起上帝一個真實的應許，剝去其上下文、條件和正確的應用。基督徒每次將一個應許從其盟約語境中扯出，用來為自己的莽撞行為辯護時，做的都是同樣的事。」[32:2]

Arlen Khachatourians, in his apologetic and teaching ministry, emphasizes that the second temptation is fundamentally about the misuse of spiritual privilege. "Just because God *can* save you doesn't mean you have the right to put yourself in a position where He *must* save you. That's not faith; that's entitlement masquerading as trust."[33]

Arlen Khachatourians w swojej apologetiskej a wučbowej służbje podšmórni, zo druhe pokušenje zasadnje wo znjewužiwanju duchowneho priwilegija je. „Jenož dokelž Bóh tebje wumóžić *móže*, njemaš prawo, so do situacije stajić, hdźež tebje wumóžić *dyrbi*. To njeje wěra; to je prawoprašenje, kotrež so jako dowěra maskuje."[33:1]

阿倫·哈恰圖里安（Arlen Khachatourians）在其護教和教導事工中強調，第二重試探根本上是關於屬靈特權的濫用。「僅僅因為上帝能拯救你，並不意味著你有權將自己置於祂必須拯救你的境地。那不是信心；那是偽裝成信靠的自以為應得。」[33:2]

Dr. Leighton Flowers, in his soteriological discussions, draws attention to the human tendency to confuse God's patience with God's approval. Flowers notes: "God may rescue you from your bad decisions once, twice, ten times — but that's grace, not a guarantee. The person who keeps making the same foolish choices and expecting God to intervene every time has confused God's longsuffering with a binding contract."[34]

Dr. Leighton Flowers w swojich soteriologiskich diskusijach skedźbnja na človjesku tendencu, Božu scerpliwosć z Božim přizwolenjom zaměnjać. Flowers podšmórni: „Bóh móže tebje z twojich špatnych rozsudy jedyn raz, dwójce, dźesać raz wumóžić — ale to je hnada, nic garantija. Človjek, kotryž dale a dale te same hłupe wólby čini a kóždy raz wočakuje, zo by Bóh zakročił, je Božu dołhoscerpnosć ze zawjazowacym kontraktom změnił."[34:1]

雷頓·弗勞沃斯博士（Dr. Leighton Flowers）在其救恩論討論中，提醒人們注意將上帝的忍耐與上帝的認可相混淆的人類傾向。弗勞沃斯指出：「上帝可能從你糟糕的決定中拯救你一次、兩次、十次——但那是恩典，不是保證。那些不斷做出同樣愚蠢選擇、卻每次都期待上帝介入的人，是將上帝的忍耐誤認為具有約束力的合同。」[34:2]

Dr. Douglas Hamp, whose work bridges biblical Hebrew scholarship and eschatology, notes the linguistic significance of Jesus' response: "Do not put the Lord your God to the test" (*lo tenassu*). Hamp explains that the Hebrew verb *nassah* carries the connotation

of "pressing to the limit" — it is not merely testing in the sense of examination, but testing in the sense of provocation. "When you deliberately create circumstances that require divine intervention, you are not testing God's faithfulness — you are provoking His patience."[35]

Dr. Douglas Hamp, čijež dźěło biblisku hebrejsku wědomosć a eschatologiju zwjazuje, podšmórni linguistiski woznam Jězusoweje wotmołwy: „Njespytuj Knjeza, swojeho Boha" (*lo tenassu*). Hamp wuswětla, zo hebrejski werb *nassah* konotaciju „do limity tłóčić" wobsahuje — to njeje jenož testowanje we zmysle pruwowanja, ale testowanje we zmysle prowokacije. „Hdyž wědomje wobstejnosće toriš, kotrež božanske zakročenje trjebaja, njetestuješ Božu wěrnosć — prowokuješ Jeho scerpliwosć."[35:1]

道格拉斯·漢普博士（**Dr. Douglas Hamp**），其工作跨越聖經希伯來文學術與末世論，指出耶穌回應的語言學意義：「不可試探主你的上帝」（*lo tenassu*）。漢普解釋，希伯來動詞*nassah*蘊含「逼迫至極限」的意味——它不僅僅是考驗意義上的試驗，而是挑釁意義上的試探。「當你故意製造需要神聖介入的處境時，你不是在試驗上帝的信實——你是在挑釁祂的耐性。」[35:2]

Jeffery Poor, in his pastoral teaching, connects the second temptation to the psychology of entitlement in prayer. Poor observes that many believers unconsciously approach God with a sense of divine obligation — as if God owes them rescue because of their status as believers. "The second temptation whispers: 'You're a child of God. He *has* to catch you.' But being a child of God means you trust the Father's wisdom, not that you test the Father's reflexes."[36]

Jeffery Poor w swojim farskim wučenju zwjazuje druhe pokušenje z psychologiju prawoměrnosće w modlitwje. Poor wobkedźbuje, zo mnozy wěriwi so njewědomje Bohu z pocuće božskeje winowatosće bliježeja — jako by jim Bóh wumóženje dłužny był,

dokelž su wěriwi. „Druhe pokušenje šepće: ‚Sy dźěćo Bóže. Wón *dyrbi* tebje łapić.' Ale dźěćo Bóže być rěka, zo mudrosci Wótca dowěriš, nic zo refleksy Wótca testuješ."[36:1]

傑弗里·普爾（Jeffery Poor）在其牧養教導中，將第二重試探與禱告中的特權心理學聯繫起來。普爾觀察到，許多信徒在不知不覺中帶著一種神聖義務感來到上帝面前——似乎上帝因為他們信徒的身份而欠他們拯救。「第二重試探低語道：『你是上帝的兒女。祂必須接住你。』但成為上帝的兒女意味著你信賴天父的智慧，而非試探天父的反應速度。」[36:2]

G.C. Lewis Sr. offers a penetrating spiritual reflection on this pattern. Lewis teaches that the second temptation reveals a deep distortion in the human understanding of covenant relationship: the belief that God's promises are unconditional guarantees that can be activated at will, rather than relational commitments that require reciprocal faithfulness. "Some people treat God's promises like a blank check. But a promise from God is embedded in a relationship — and that relationship requires that we walk in wisdom, not in presumption."[37]

G.C. Lewis Sr. poskićuje přenikajace duchowne rozmyslowanje wo tutym mustru. Lewis wuči, zo druhe pokušenje hłuboke skřiwjenje w człowjeskim zrozumjenju zwjazkoweje poćahnosće wozjewja: wěru, zo Bože slubjenja su bjezwuměnjite garantije, kotrež so po woli aktiwizować dadźa, město relacionalnych zawjazanjow, kotrež wzajomnu wěrnosć trjebaja. „Někotři ludźo wobchadźeja z Božimi slubjenisami kaž z bjezawowym čekom. Ale slubjenje wot Boha je w poćahnosći zasadźene — a ta poćahnosć žada, zo w mudrosći chodźimy, nic w přetrjebnosći."[37:1]

G.C.路易斯長老（G.C. Lewis Sr.）就這一模式提供了深刻的屬靈反思。路易斯教導，第二重試探揭示了人類對盟約關係之理解的深層扭曲：認為上帝的應許是可以隨意啟動的無條件保證，而非需要相互忠信的關係性承諾。「有些人把上帝的應許當作空白支票。但來自上帝的應許是嵌入在一段關係中的——而那段關係要求我們行在智慧中，而非行在僭越中。」[37:2]

Rikhard Hartikainen, in his theological reflections, notes that the second temptation also carries an ecclesiological warning: churches that promise their members miraculous protection from all consequences — financial, physical, relational — are institutional versions of Satan standing on the pinnacle, quoting Psalm 91, and encouraging the faithful to jump.[38]

Rikhard Hartikainen w swojich teologiskich refleksijach podšmórni, zo druhe pokušenje tež ekleziologiske warnowanje wobsahuje: cyrkwje, kotrež swojim członam dźiwowe škitanje před wšěmi naslědkami — financnymi, ćělnymi, relacionalnym — slubja, su institucionalneé werzije Satana, kotryž na wjeršku templa steji, Psalm 91 cituje a wěriwych k skakanju pozbudźuje.[38:1]

里克哈德·哈提凱寧（Rikhard Hartikainen）在其神學反思中指出，第二重試探也蘊含教會論的警告：那些向會眾承諾奇蹟般地免於一切後果——無論是財務的、身體的還是關係的——的教會，就是撒但站在聖殿頂上、引用詩篇九十一篇、鼓勵信徒跳下去的制度化版本。[38:2]

Jesus' definitive response — "Do not put the Lord your God to the test" (Matthew 4:7, citing Deuteronomy 6:16) — establishes the second principle of authentic prayer: **prayer does not manufacture crises to test God's faithfulness; it trusts God's faithfulness within the circumstances He has ordained.**

Jězusowa definitiwna wotmołwa — „Njespytuj Knjeza, swojeho Boha" (Matej 4,7, cituje Deuteronomium 6,16) — postaji druhi princip awtentiskeje modlitwy: **modlitwa njewuhotuje krizy, zo by Božu wěrnosć testowała; dowěrja Božej wěrnosci znutřka wobstejnosćow, kotrež je wón postajił.**

耶穌的決定性回應——「不可試探主你的上帝」（馬太福音4:7，引用申命記6:16）——確立了真正禱告的第二個原則：禱告不製造危機來試驗上帝的信實；它在上帝所命定的處境之中信賴上帝的信實。

IV. The Third Temptation: The Kingdoms of the World — The Prayer That Seeks to Control Life and Make God Our Servant

Třeće pokušenje: Kralestwa swěta — Modlitwa, kotraž pyta žiwjenje kontrolować a Boha k našemu służownikej činić

第三重試探：世上的萬國——尋求掌控人生並使上帝成為我們僕人的禱告

A. The Biblical Text | Biblijski tekst | 經文

Matthew 4:8–10 — "Again, the devil took him to a very high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their splendor. 'All this I will give you,' he said, 'if you will bow down and worship me.' Jesus said to him, 'Away from me, Satan! For it is written: Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only.'" (cf. Deuteronomy 6:13)

Matej 4,8–10 — „Zaso wzja jeho djaboł sobu na jara wysoku hóru a pokaza jemu wšitke kralestwa swěta a jich pyšnosć. ‚To wšitko budu ći dać,' rjekny, ‚jeli so přede mnu pokłóniš.' Jězus jemu rjekny: ‚Wotstupi wote mnje, Satano! Přetož pisane steji: Česć Knjeza, swojeho Boha, a jemu samomu służ.'" (hlej Deuteronomium 6,13)

馬太福音**4:8-10** —「魔鬼又帶他上了一座最高的山，將世上的萬國與萬國的榮華都指給他看，對他說：『你若俯伏拜我，我就把這一切都賜給你。』耶穌說：『撒但，退去吧！因為經上記著說：當拜主你的神，單要事奉他。』」（參申命記6:13）

B. The Ultimate Blasphemy: Making God Serve Us | Najwjetša blasfemija: Z Boha našeho służownika činić | 終極的褻瀆：使上帝服事我們

The third temptation is the most audacious and the most revealing. Satan offers Jesus *sovereignty* — control over all the kingdoms of the world — in exchange for a single act of worship directed at Satan. The surface reading concerns idolatry, and this is correct. But the deeper structure reveals the ultimate distortion of prayer: **the desire to control one's own life, to be the sovereign of one's own existence, and — most blasphemously — to make God (or any spiritual power) a means to that end**.

Třeće pokušenje je najsmjerniše a najwuswětlowace. Satan poskićuje Jězusej *suwerenitu* — kontrolu nad wšěmi kralestwami swěta — za jedyn jednoworny akt česćowanja, kotryž je na Satana směrjeny. Powjerchowe čitanje potrjechi modłarstwo, a to je prawe. Ale hłubša struktura wozjewja kónčnu distorciju modlitwy: **žadosć, swoje swójske žiwjenje kontrolować, suwereni swojeho swójskeje eksistency być a — najblasfemscy — Boha (abo někajku duchownu móc) k srědkej k tutomu cilej činić**.

第三重試探是最大膽、也是最具揭示性的。撒但向耶穌提供主權——對世上萬國的控制——以換取一個指向撒但的敬拜行為。表層解讀涉及偶像崇拜，這是正確的。但更深層的結構揭示了禱告的終極扭曲：渴望掌控自己的生命，成為自己存在的主宰，並且——最褻瀆的是——使上帝（或任何屬靈力量）成為達成這一目的的手段。

This is the prayer that says: *"Lord, give me power over my circumstances, my future, my relationships, my career, my health, my destiny."* It sounds pious — who would not want God's blessing on all of these? — but when the underlying motive is **control** rather than **surrender**, the prayer has inverted the fundamental order of creation. The creature is no longer asking to serve the Creator; the creature is asking the Creator to serve the creature's ambition.

To je modlitwa, kotraž praji: *„Knježe, daj mi móc nad mojimi wobstejnosćemi, mojej přichodnosću, mojimi poćahami, mojej karjeru, mojim strowjom, mojim wusudom."* Zda

so pobožne — štó by nochcył Bože žohnowanje na wšo to? — ale hdyž zakładna motiwacija **kontrola** město **poddawanje** je, je modlitwa zasadny porjadk stworjenja přewobroćiła. Stworjenje wjacy njeprosy, zo by Stwórcemu służiło; stworjenje prosy, zo by Stwórc ambiciji stworjenja służił.

這是一種說：*「主啊，給我掌控我的處境、我的未來、我的關係、我的事業、我的健康、我的命運的權力。」*的禱告。聽起來很敬虔——誰不想要上帝對這一切的祝福呢？——但當底層動機是掌控而非降服時，這禱告便顛覆了受造界的根本秩序。受造物不再是請求服事造物主；受造物是在請求造物主服事受造物的野心。

Pastor Stephen Tong has been perhaps the most forceful voice on this point within Asian Christendom. Tong thunders: "The greatest heresy in the modern church is not a doctrinal error — it is the functional atheism of making God our servant. When you pray for God to give you success, health, wealth, and power, and you call that 'faith,' you have committed the sin of the third temptation. You have made God bow before you, and that is the worship of Satan, because Satan's entire project is the inversion of the Creator-creature relationship." Tong identifies the prosperity gospel, the self-help gospel, and the therapeutic gospel as three institutional manifestations of the third temptation — each one reducing God from sovereign Lord to cosmic butler.[39]

Farař Stephen Tong je snano najsylniši hłós k tutomu dypkej w aziatiskím křesćanstwje. Tong hrimotuje: „Najwjetša herezija w modernej cyrkwi njeje doktrinowy zmylk — je to funkcionalny ateizm, z Boha našeho służownika činić. Hdyž so modliš, zo by ći Bóh wuspěch, strowje, bohatstwo a móc dał, a to ‚wěru' mjenuješ, sy hrěch třećeho pokušenja spachał. Sy Boha k pokłónjenju před tobu přinuzył, a to je česćowanje Satana, dokelž cyły Satanowy projekt přewobroćenje poćahnosće Stwórc-stworjenje je." Tong identifikuje ewangelij blahobytnosće, ewangelij sebjepomocy a terapeutiski ewangelij jako tři institucionalneé manifestacije třećeho

pokušenja — kóždy jedyn Boha z suwereneho Knjeza na kosmiského butlera redukuje.[39:1]

唐崇榮牧師或許是亞洲基督教界在這一點上最有力的聲音。唐牧師雷鳴般地宣講：「現代教會最大的異端不是教義上的錯誤——而是使上帝成為我們僕人的功能性無神論。當你禱告求上帝給你成功、健康、財富和權力，而你稱之為『信心』時，你就犯了第三重試探之罪。你已經使上帝向你俯伏，而那就是對撒但的敬拜，因為撒但的整個計劃就是顛倒造物主與受造物之間的關係。」唐牧師將成功福音、自助福音和療癒福音辨識為第三重試探的三種制度性表現——每一種都將上帝從至高的主宰降格為宇宙管家。[39:2]

Voddie Baucham reinforces this analysis with characteristic theological precision: "The prosperity gospel is the third temptation institutionalized. Satan says, 'I'll give you the kingdoms.' The prosperity preacher says, 'God will give you the kingdoms.' But the underlying assumption is the same: that the kingdoms are the point, and that God (or Satan) exists to deliver them to you. The moment you make the kingdoms the goal and God the means, you have worshipped Satan, whether you realize it or not."[40]

Voddie Baucham sylni tutu analyzu ze swojej charakteristiskej teologiskej preciznosću: „Ewangelij blahobytnosće je třeće pokušenje, kotrež je so institucializowało. Satan praji: ‚Dam ći kralestwa.' Prědarar blahobytnosće praji: ‚Bóh ći kralestwa da.' Ale zakładna představba je samsna: zo kralestwa cil su a zo Bóh (abo Satan) eksistuje, zo by je tebi dodał. Tón wokomik, hdyž kralestwa cil a Boha srědk činiš, sy Satana česćił, hač to spóznajěješ abo nic."[40:1]

沃迪·鮑肯以其特有的神學精確性強化了這一分析：「成功福音是第三重試探的制度化。撒但說：『我要把萬國給你。』成功福音的傳道人說：『上帝要把萬國給你。』但底層的假設是一樣的：萬國是目標，而上帝（或撒但）的存在是為了將它們交付給你。當你使萬國成為目標、使上帝成為手段的那一刻，你就已經拜了撒但，不論你是否意識到這一點。」[40:2]

Bishop Robert Barron provides the Catholic theological framework for understanding why this inversion is so profoundly blasphemous. Barron draws on Thomas Aquinas' teaching that God is not a being among beings but *ipsum esse subsistens* — subsistent being itself. To treat God as a means to any end is to place something above *Being Itself*, which is a metaphysical absurdity and a spiritual abomination. Barron writes: "The third temptation is the temptation to instrumentalize God — to use the Absolute as a tool for achieving the relative. Every prayer that treats God as a means to an end participates in this blasphemy, because it places the finite above the Infinite."[41]

Biskop Robert Barron podawa katolski teologiski framework za zrozumjenje, čehodla je tute přewobroćenje tak hłuboko blasfemiski. Barron čerpa z wučby Thomasa Aquinskeje, zo Bóh njeje bytosć mjez bytosćemi, ale *ipsum esse subsistens* — sebi-wobstojacy Być sam. Z Bohom jako srědkom k někajkemu cilej wobchadźeć rěka něšto nad *Być Sam* stajić, štož je metafyziski absurd a duchowna groza. Barron piše: „Třeće pokušenje je pokušenje, Boha instrumentalizować — Absolutneho jako nastroj za docpěće relatiwneho wužiwać. Kóžda modlitwa, kotraž z Bohom jako srědkom k cilej wobchadźa, na tutej blasfemiji participuje, dokelž Kónčne nad Njekónčne staja."[41:1]

巴倫主教提供了天主教神學框架來理解為何這一顛倒如此深刻地具有褻瀆性。巴倫援引多瑪斯·阿奎那的教導：上帝不是存有者中的一個存有者，而是自存的存有本身（ipsum esse subsistens）。將上帝當作達成任何目的之手段，就是將某物置於存有本身之上，這在形而上學上是荒謬的，在靈性上是可憎的。巴倫寫道：「第三重試探是將上帝工具化的試探——使用絕對者作為達成相對之事的工具。每一個將上帝當作達成目的之手段的禱告都參與了這種褻瀆，因為它將有限者置於無限者之上。」[41:2]

Dr. Michael Heiser brings his expertise in the divine council worldview to illuminate the cosmic dimensions of the third temptation. Heiser notes that Satan's offer of "all the kingdoms of the world" is a claim to authority that rightfully belongs to Yahweh (Psalm 2:7–8; Daniel 7:13–14). The offer is, in Heiser's framework, an invitation to participate in

the *Deuteronomy 32 worldview* rebellion — the rebellion of the divine beings who were assigned authority over the nations but used that authority for self-glorification rather than loyalty to Yahweh. For Heiser, any prayer that seeks power for self-glorification participates in this same cosmic rebellion: "The desire for control is the original sin of the elohim, and it is the perennial temptation of humanity. Every prayer for power that is not rooted in service to Yahweh is an echo of the rebellion in the divine council."[42]

Dr. Michael Heiser přinjese swoju ekspertizu we widźe božanskeje rady, zo by kosmiske dimenzije třećeho pokušenja wobswětlił. Heiser podšmórni, zo Satanowa poskitka „wšěch kralestwow swěta" je prašenje za awtoritu, kotraž Jahwej praworunje dźě přisłuša (Psalm 2,7–8; Daniel 7,13–14). Poskitka je, w Heiserowym frameworku, přeprošenje, na Deuteronomij 32-zběžce podźělnych być — zběžce božanskich bytosćow, kotrež buchu z awtoritu nad narodami zastajene, ale tutu awtoritu za sebjesławizaciju město lojalnosće k Jahwej wužiwachu. Za Heisera kóžda modlitwa, kotraž móc za sebjesławizaciju pyta, na tej samsnej kosmiskej zběžce participuje: „Žadosć za kontrolu je prěnjotny hrěch Elohim a je wěčne pokušenje człowjestwa. Kóžda modlitwa za móc, kotraž njeje w służbje k Jahwej zakorjenjena, je echo zběžki w božanskej radźe."[42:1]

邁可·乃希瑟博士運用其在神聖會議世界觀方面的專長來闡明第三重試探的宇宙性維度。乃希瑟指出，撒但提供「世上的萬國」是對理應屬於耶和華之權柄的宣稱（詩篇2:7-8；但以理書7:13-14）。在乃希瑟的框架中，這個提議是邀請參與申命記三十二章世界觀的叛亂——那些被指派管轄列國之權柄的神聖存有，卻將那權柄用於自我榮耀而非效忠耶和華的叛亂。對乃希瑟而言，任何尋求權力以自我榮耀的禱告都參與了同一場宇宙性的叛亂：「對掌控的渴望是以羅欣原初的罪，也是人類永恆的試探。每一個不植根於服事耶和華的求權禱告，都是神聖會議中那場叛亂的回聲。」[42:2]

John Lennox, the Oxford mathematician and Christian apologist, approaches the third temptation from the perspective of the modern idolatry of autonomy. Lennox observes

that contemporary Western culture has made personal autonomy the highest value — the right to define one's own existence, meaning, and destiny. For Lennox, this is precisely the offer Satan makes in the third temptation: "Satan is essentially offering Jesus self-determination — the chance to be His own master, to define His own mission, to chart His own course. And Jesus refuses, because authentic existence is not self-determination but God-determination." Lennox notes that prayer which seeks primarily to enlist God in our self-determined plans is a Christianized version of this same autonomy-worship.[43]

John Lennox, Oxfordski matematik a křesćanski apologet, přistupuje k třećemu pokušenju z perspektiwy moderneho modłarstwa awtonomije. Lennox wobkedźbuje, zo sučasna zapadna kultura je wosobnu awtonomiju k najwyšej hódnoće činjała — prawo, swoju swójsku eksistencu, zmysł a wosud definować. Za Lennox je to dokładnje ta poskitka, kotruž Satan w třećim pokušenju čini: „Satan Jězusej esencielnje samodefiniciju poskićuje — šansu, swój swójski mištr być, swoju swójsku misiju definować, swój swójski kurs rysować. A Jězus wotpokaza, dokelž awtentiska eksistenca njeje samoodredźenje, ale Bohopostajenje." Lennox podšmórni, zo modlitwa, kotraž hłownje pyta, Boha do našich samodefinowanychplanow zapřahnyć, je christianizowana werzija teho sameho česćowanja awtonomije.[43:1]

約翰·倫諾克斯（**John Lennox**），牛津數學家兼基督教護教學家，從現代對自主性之偶像崇拜的角度來考察第三重試探。倫諾克斯觀察到，當代西方文化已將個人自主性提升為最高價值——定義自己的存在、意義和命運的權利。對倫諾克斯而言，這正是撒但在第三重試探中所提供的：「撒但本質上是在向耶穌提供自我決定——成為自己主人的機會，定義自己使命的機會，規劃自己道路的機會。而耶穌拒絕了，因為真正的存在不是自我決定，而是上帝決定。」倫諾克斯指出，那種主要尋求將上帝招募進我們自我決定之計劃中的禱告，是同一種自主性崇拜的基督教化版本。[43:2]

Charlie Kirk, the young conservative commentator and Christian public intellectual, brings a cultural-political dimension. Kirk has noted that the third temptation resonates powerfully in an age of social media, political ambition, and the pursuit of influence. Kirk observes: "Every generation faces the third temptation in its own way. For ours, it's the temptation of platform — the belief that if we just had enough influence, enough reach, enough followers, we could change the world. But Jesus turned down the biggest platform ever offered, because He knew that the mission of God doesn't require worldly power. It requires obedience."[44]

Charlie Kirk, młody konserwatiwny komentator a křesćanski zjawny intelektual, přinjese kulturno-politisku dimenziju. Kirk je podšmórnił, zo třeće pokušenje sylnje rezonuje w dobje socialnych medijow, politiskeje ambicije a pytanja za wliwom. Kirk wobkedźbuje: „Kóžda generacija wobliči třeće pokušenje na swój wašnj. Za našu je to pokušenje platformy — přeswědčenje, zo by-li my jeno dosć wliwa, dosć dosaha, dosć followerow měli, móhli swět změnić. Ale Jězus je najwjetšu platformu, kotraž bu jemu někdy poskićena, wotpokazał, dokelž wědźeše, zo misija Boha njepotrebuje swětowsku móc. Trjeba posłušnosć."[44:1]

查理·乃柯克（**Charlie Kirk**），年輕的保守派評論家和基督教公共知識份子，帶來了文化政治維度。柯克指出，第三重試探在社交媒體、政治抱負和追求影響力的時代引起了強烈共鳴。柯克觀察道：「每一代人都以自己的方式面對第三重試探。對我們這一代而言，那是平臺的試探——相信只要我們有足夠的影響力、足夠的覆蓋面、足夠的追隨者，我們就能改變世界。但耶穌拒絕了有史以來最大的平臺，因為祂知道上帝的使命不需要世俗的權力。它需要的是順服。」[44:2]

David Diga Hernandez, in his Spirit-filled teaching on prayer and the power of the Holy Spirit, warns against what he calls the "Saul syndrome" — the tendency to seek God's anointing for purposes of personal empire rather than kingdom service. Hernandez draws a direct line from King Saul, who sought to use the anointing for self-preservation

(1 Samuel 15), to the third temptation, where Satan offers Jesus a kingdom without a cross. "Every time you pray for God's power but you're not willing to carry God's cross, you are falling for the third temptation. Power without obedience is witchcraft."[45]

David Diga Hernandez w swojej duchom napjelnjenej wučbje wo modlitwje a mocy Swjateho Ducha warnuje před tym, štož wón „Saulowy syndrom" mjenuje — tendenca, zamazanje Bóže za zaměry wosobnjeho imperija město kralestwoweje służby pytać. Hernandez ćehnje direktnu liniju wot krala Saula, kotryž zamazanje za samowobaranje wužiwać pyta (1. Kniha Samuelowa 15), k třećemu pokušenju, hdźež Satan Jězusej kralestwo bjez křiža poskićuje. „Kóždy raz, hdyž so wo Božu móc modliš, ale njejsy zwólniwy, Boži křiž nosyć, padnješ do třećeho pokušenja. Móc bjez posłušnosće je wěšćerstwo."[45:1]

大衛·迪加·赫南德茲（David Diga Hernandez）在其關於禱告與聖靈大能的滿有聖靈之教導中，警告他所稱的「掃羅症候群」——尋求上帝的膏抹以建立個人帝國而非服事國度的傾向。赫南德茲從掃羅王——他試圖將膏抹用於自我保全（撒母耳記上15章）——直接追溯到第三重試探，在那裡撒但向耶穌提供一個不用十字架的國度。「每當你為上帝的能力禱告，卻不願背負上帝的十字架時，你就是在落入第三重試探。沒有順服的能力就是巫術。」[45:2]

Bro Dr Prem, in his theological teaching ministry, identifies the third temptation as the root of all false religion: the attempt to use the divine to serve human purposes. Prem teaches: "Every religion that is centered on what God can do for man rather than what man owes to God is, at its root, a repetition of the third temptation. True prayer begins when we stop asking, 'What can God do for me?' and start asking, 'What does God require of me?'"[46]

Bro Dr Prem w swojej teologiskej wučbowej służbje identifikuje třeće pokušenje jako korjeń wšeho fałšneho nabožeho: pospyt, božanske za čłowjeske zaměry wužiwać. Prem wuči: „Kóžde nabožentwo, kotrež je na to centrowane, štož Bóh za čłowjeka

činić móže, město na to, štož człowjek Bohu dłuži, je w swojim korjenju wospjetowanje třećeho pokušenja. Woprawdźita modlitwa so započnje, hdyž přestanjemy prašeć: ‚Štož Bóh za mnje činić móže?' a započnjemy prašeć: ‚Što Bóh wote mnje žada?'"[46:1]

普雷姆弟兄博士（Bro Dr Prem）在其神學教導事工中，將第三重試探辨識為一切假宗教的根源：企圖利用神聖來服事人類的目的。普雷姆教導：「每一種以上帝能為人做什麼為中心、而非以人虧欠上帝什麼為中心的宗教，在其根源上都是第三重試探的重演。真正的禱告始於我們不再問：『上帝能為我做什麼？』而開始問：『上帝要求我做什麼？』」[46:2]

Fr. Dan Reehil, in his pastoral ministry and practical spiritual direction, warns that the third temptation manifests in the prayer lives of ordinary Christians more frequently than most realize. Reehil observes: "You don't have to be praying for world domination to fall into the third temptation. Every time you pray with the underlying assumption that your plan is better than God's plan, and you're asking God to get on board with *your* agenda rather than submitting to *His*, you are offering God the role of servant rather than Lord."[47]

Farař Dan Reehil w swojej farskej służbje a praktiskej duchownej nawodźe warnuje, zo so třeće pokušenje w modlitwowym žiwjenju wšědnych křesćanow husćišo manifestuje, hač sej wjele ludźi wuwědomja. Reehil wobkedźbuje: „Njetrjebaš so wo swětowsku dominancu modlić, zo by do třećeho pokušenja padnył. Kóždy raz, hdyž so z tym zakładnym předwoznamjenjom modliš, zo twój plan je lěpši hač Boži plan, a Boha prosyš, zo by so *twojej* agendźe přidružił, město zo by so *jeho* agendźe poddał, Bohu rolu służownika město Knjeza poskićuješ."[47:1]

里希爾神父（Fr. Dan Reehil）在其牧養事工和實際屬靈指導中警告，第三重試探在普通基督徒的禱告生活中的表現比大多數人意識到的更為頻繁。里希爾觀察道：「你不必為世界統治而禱告才會落入第三重試探。每當你帶著『你的計劃比上帝的計劃更好』的底層假設來

禱告，要求上帝加入你的議程而非順服祂的議程時，你就是在向上帝提供僕人的角色，而非主的角色。」[47:2]

Vlad Savchuk drives this point home with a vivid analogy: "Prayer is not a steering wheel for your life. Prayer is the passenger seat. God is driving. When you grab the wheel and try to steer God where you want to go, you've committed the sin of the third temptation — you've tried to make God your chauffeur."[48]

Vlad Savchuk tutón dypk z jasnym přirownanjom domoj ćerje: „Modlitwa njeje koleso za twoje žiwjenje. Modlitwa je pasažěrske sydło. Bóh jědźe. Hdyž koleso hrabnješ a pospytuješ Boha tam stajić, hdźež chceš jěć, sy hrěch třećeho pokušenja spachał — sy pospytował, z Boha swojeho šofera činić."[48:1]

薩夫丘克以一個生動的類比將這一觀點帶回家：「禱告不是你人生的方向盤。禱告是副駕駛座。上帝在開車。當你抓住方向盤，試圖將上帝引向你想去的地方時，你就犯了第三重試探之罪——你試圖使上帝成為你的司機。」[48:2]

Dr. John Bergsma adds a liturgical-sacramental depth by noting that the third temptation is an anti-Eucharist: whereas the Eucharist is the supreme act of worship in which the creature offers itself to the Creator, the third temptation inverts this by having the creature demand that the Creator offer the world to the creature. "The Mass is the antidote to the third temptation. In the Mass, we offer ourselves — our lives, our plans, our ambitions — to God. The third temptation says, 'No — God should offer the world to me.' Every prayer that is more about receiving than offering participates in this inversion."[49]

Dr. John Bergsma přidawa liturgisku-sakramentalnu hłubokosć přez podšmórnjenitwarje, zo třeće pokušenje anti-eucharistija je: hdźež eucharistija je najwyši akt česćowanja, w kotrymž stworjenje so Stwórcej poskićuje, třeće pokušenje to přewobroća přez to, zo stworjenje žada, zo by Stwórc swět stworjenju poskićił. „Mša je

antidot k třećemu pokušenju. W mši poskićujemy so — naše žiwjenja, naše plany, naše ambicije — Bohu. Třeće pokušenje praji: ‚Ně — Bóh dyrbjał swět mně poskićić.' Kóžda modlitwa, kotraž bóle wo přijimanje hač wo poskićenje je, na tutym přewobroćenju participuje."[49:1]

約翰·柏格斯馬博士添加了禮儀-聖事的深度，指出第三重試探是一個反聖體聖事：聖體聖事是至高的敬拜行為，其中受造物將自己獻給造物主；而第三重試探將此顛倒，讓受造物要求造物主將世界獻給受造物。「彌撒是第三重試探的解藥。在彌撒中，我們獻上自己——我們的生命、我們的計劃、我們的抱負——給上帝。第三重試探說：『不——上帝應該把世界獻給我。』每一個更關乎領受而非獻上的禱告都參與了這一顛倒。」[49:2]

Dr. Karlo Broussard, elaborating on the Thomistic dimension, notes that the third temptation violates what Aquinas calls the *virtue of religion* (*religio*) — the habit of rendering to God what is due to Him, which is total worship and total service. Broussard observes: "The virtue of religion demands that we orient everything toward God as our ultimate end. The third temptation reverses this: it orients God toward us as our ultimate means. This is not merely a sin; it is the ur-sin — the sin that underlies all other sins, because it replaces God with the self at the center of reality."[50]

Dr. Karlo Broussard, wobšěrnišo wo tomistiskej dimenziji wuswětlejo, podšmórni, zo třeće pokušenje to ranja, štož Aquinas *cnosć nabožiny* (*religio*) mjenuje — zwučenosć, Bohu to wotdać, štož so jemu dłuži, to rěka cyłkowne česćowanje a cyłkownu służbu. Broussard wobkedźbuje: „Cnosć nabožiny žada, zo wšitko k Bohu jako našemu kónčnemu cilej orientujemy. Třeće pokušenje to přewobroća: orientuje Boha k nam jako našemu kónčnemu srědkej. To njeje jenož hrěch; to je pra-hrěch — hrěch, kotryž pod wšěmi druhimi hrěchami leži, dokelž Boha ze sebju w centru reality wumělnja."[50:1]

卡洛·布魯薩爾博士在多瑪斯主義維度的進一步闡述中指出，第三重試探違反了阿奎那所稱的宗教之德（religio）——向上帝歸還所應得之物的習慣，即全然的敬拜和全然的事奉。布魯

薩爾觀察道：「宗教之德要求我們將一切導向上帝作為我們的終極目的。第三重試探將此逆轉：它將上帝導向我們作為我們的終極手段。這不僅僅是一種罪；這是原罪之罪——是一切其他罪的底層之罪，因為它在現實的中心以自我取代了上帝。」[50:2]

Jesus' response — "Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only" (Matthew 4:10, citing Deuteronomy 6:13) — is the most absolute of His three responses. It does not merely correct a distortion; it reasserts the **fundamental orientation of all created existence**: worship and service directed exclusively toward God. Authentic prayer is not a means of gaining control over one's life; it is a means of **surrendering** control to the One who alone is worthy of worship and obedience.

Jězusowa wotmołwa — „Česć Knjeza, swojeho Boha, a jemu samomu słuž" (Matej 4,10, cituje Deuteronomium 6,13) — je najabsolutnišad z jeho třoch wotmołwow. Njekorreguje jenož distorciju; wona znowa potwierdźa **fundamentalnu orientaciju wšeje stworjeneje eksistency**: česćowanje a służbu, kotrež su wukljućnje na Boha směrjene. Awtentiska modlitwa njeje srědk, kontrolu nad žiwjenjom docpěć; je srědk, kontrolu temu **poddać**, kotryž sam česćowanja a posłušnosće hódny je.

耶穌的回應——「當拜主你的神，單要事奉他」（馬太福音4:10，引用申命記6:13）——是祂三次回應中最絕對的。它不僅僅糾正一種扭曲；它重新宣告了一切受造存在的根本方向：專一地指向上帝的敬拜和事奉。真正的禱告不是獲取對自己生命之掌控的手段；它是將掌控交出給那唯一配得敬拜與順服者的途徑。

V. Theological Synthesis: The Grammar of Authentic Prayer | Teologiska synteza: Gramatika awtentiskeje modlitwy | 神學綜合：真正禱告的語法

The three temptations, read as a tutorial on blasphemous prayer, reveal a coherent structure. Each temptation targets a different aspect of the creature's relationship to the Creator, and each distorts prayer in a correspondingly different way.

Tři pokušenja, čitane jako tutorij wo blasfemiskej modlitwje, wozjewjeja koherentnu strukturu. Kóžde pokušenje ciluje na druhi aspekt poćaha stworjenja ke Stwórcemu a kóžde distortuje modlitwu we wotpowědnje druhim wašnju.

三重試探，作為關於褻瀆性禱告的教程來閱讀，呈現出一個連貫的結構。每一重試探瞄準受造物與造物主之關係的不同面向，每一重以相應不同的方式扭曲禱告。

The **first temptation** (stones to bread) targets **God's providence** — asking God to restructure reality to match our desires. The correction is *dependence*: "Man shall not live on bread alone, but on every word that comes from the mouth of God."

Prěnje pokušenje (kamjenje do chlěba) ciluje na **Bože zastaranje** — Boha prosyć, zo by realitu přestrukturował, zo by našim žadosćam wotpowědowała. Korekcija je *wotwisnosć*: „Človjek njeje živy wot chlěba samoho, ale wot kóždeho słowa, kotrež z rta Božeho wuchadźa."

第一重試探（石頭變餅）瞄準上帝的護理——要求上帝重構現實以匹配我們的慾望。糾正是倚靠：「人活著，不是單靠食物，乃是靠神口裡所出的一切話。」

The **second temptation** (jumping from the temple) targets **God's faithfulness** — manufacturing crises to force God to prove Himself. The correction is *trust*: "Do not put the Lord your God to the test."

Druhe pokušenje (ze templa skočić) ciluje na **Božu wěrnosć** — krizy wuhotować, zo by Boha nuzowali so dopokazać. Korekcija je *dowěra*: „Njespytuj Knjeza, swojeho Boha."

第二重試探（從聖殿跳下）瞄準上帝的信實——製造危機以迫使上帝證明自己。糾正是信賴：「不可試探主你的上帝。」

The **third temptation** (kingdoms of the world) targets **God's sovereignty** — seeking to control life and make God serve human ambition. The correction is *exclusive worship*: "Worship the Lord your God, and serve him only."

Třeće pokušenje (kralestwa swěta) ciluje na **Božu suwerenitu** — pytać žiwjenje kontrolować a Boha człowjeskej ambiciji służić dać. Korekcija je *wuključne česćowanje*: „Česć Knjeza, swojeho Boha, a jemu samomu słuž."

第三重試探（世上萬國）瞄準上帝的主權——尋求掌控生命並使上帝服事人類的野心。糾正是專一的敬拜：「當拜主你的神，單要事奉他。」

Together, the three corrections constitute the grammar of authentic prayer: **dependence, trust, and worship**. This is precisely the pattern of the Lord's Prayer (Matthew 6:9–13), which Jesus teaches shortly after the temptation narrative: "Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name" (worship); "your kingdom come, your will be done" (trust and surrender of control); "give us today our daily bread" (dependence — note: daily bread, not stones turned into bread on demand).

Hromadźe tworja tři korekcije gramatiku awtentiskeje modlitwy: **wotwisnosć, dowěru a česćowanje**. To je dokładnje mustr Wótčenaša (Matej 6,9–13), kotryž Jězus bórze po naratiwy pokušenja wuči: „Wótče naš w njebjesach, swjeć so twoje mjeno" (česćowanje); „přińdź twoje kralestwo, stań so twoja wola" (dowěra a wzdaće kontroly); „daj nam dźensa naš wšědny chlěb" (wotwisnosć — kedźbu: wšědny chlěb, nic kamjenje na žadanje do chlěba přeměnjene).

三項糾正共同構成了真正禱告的語法：倚靠、信賴與敬拜。這正是主禱文（馬太福音6:9-13）的模式，耶穌在試探敘事之後不久便教導了這禱告：「我們在天上的父：願人都尊你的名為聖」（敬拜）；「願你的國降臨；願你的旨意行在地上，如同行在天上」（信賴與交出掌控）；「我

們日用的飲食，今日賜給我們」（倚靠——注意：是日用的飲食，不是按要求將石頭變成的餅）。

As **Spurgeon** summarized: "The right prayer is not 'Lord, give me what I want,' but 'Lord, make me want what you give.'"[51]

Kaž **Spurgeon** zjeće: „Prawa modlitwa njeje ‚Knježe, daj mi, štož chcu', ale ‚Knježe, čiń, zo chcu, štož ty dawaš.'"[51:1]

正如司布真所總結的：「正確的禱告不是『主啊，給我所要的』，而是『主啊，使我要祢所給的。』」[51:2]

VI. Conclusion: The Cross as the Paradigm of Authentic Prayer | Zaključk: Křiž jako paradigma awtentiskeje modlitwy | 結論：十字架作為真正禱告的範式

The definitive demonstration of authentic prayer is found not in the wilderness but in Gethsemane. There, Jesus — facing suffering infinitely greater than hunger, danger, or the loss of worldly power — prays the prayer that perfectly inverts all three temptations:

Definitiwne předstajenje awtentiskeje modlitwy njenamakamy w pusćinje, ale w Getsemanje. Tam Jězus — twarjo ćerpjenje, kotrež je bjezkončnje wjetše hač hłód, strach abo zhubjernje swětowskeje mocy — so modli z modlitwu, kotraž wšě tři pokušenja perfektnje přewobroća:

真正禱告的決定性示範不是在曠野，而是在客西馬尼園。在那裡，耶穌——面對比飢餓、危險或失去世俗權力無限更大的苦難——禱告了一個完美地逆轉所有三重試探的禱告：

"My Father, if it is possible, may this cup be taken from me. Yet not as I will, but as you will." (Matthew 26:39)

„Mój Wótče, je-li móžno, wzmi tutu keluchu wote mnje. Tola nic kaž ja chcu, ale kaž ty chceš." (Matej 26,39)

「我父啊，倘若可行，求你叫這杯離開我。然而，不要照我的意思，只要照你的意思。」（馬太福音26:39）

Here is the model: Jesus brings His desire honestly before the Father (He does not pretend the cup is easy), but He subordinates His desire to the Father's will. He does not ask God to change reality to avoid suffering (first temptation). He does not manufacture a crisis and demand rescue (second temptation). He does not seize control of His own destiny (third temptation). He submits. He worships. He trusts. He depends.

Tu je model: Jězus přinjese swoju žadosć čestnje před Wótca (njepředstaja so, zo je keluch lochki), ale podrjaduje swoju žadosć woli Wótca. Njeprosy Boha, zo by realitu změnił, zo by ćerpjenje wobešoł (prěnje pokušenje). Njewuhotuje krizy a nježada wumóženja (druhe pokušenje). Njezapaduje kontrolu nad swojim swójskim wusudom (třeće pokušenje). Podda so. Česćuje. Dowěrja. Je wotwisny.

這就是範式：耶穌將祂的渴望誠實地帶到天父面前（祂沒有假裝這杯是輕省的），但祂將自己的渴望從屬於天父的旨意。祂沒有要求上帝改變現實以避免苦難（第一重試探）。祂沒有製造危機並要求拯救（第二重試探）。祂沒有抓取對自己命運的掌控（第三重試探）。祂順服。祂敬拜。祂信賴。祂倚靠。

This is how we are to pray. Not as masters demanding service from a cosmic servant, but as creatures surrendering to a sovereign Creator. Not as consumers placing orders, but as children trusting a Father. Not as controllers manipulating outcomes, but as worshippers offering ourselves.

Tak mamy so my modlić. Nic jako mištrojo, kiž służbu wot kosmiskeho służownika žadaja, ale jako stworjenja, kotrež so suwerenemu Stwórcemu poddawaja. Nic jako

konsumenty, kiž skazanja stajeja, ale jako dźěći, kotrež Wótcej dowěrjeja. Nic jako kontrolerojo, kiž wuslědki manipuluja, ale jako česćowarjo, kiž so sami poskićuja.

我們當如此禱告。不是作為主人向宇宙僕人要求服務，而是作為受造物向至高造物主降服。不是作為消費者下訂單，而是作為兒女信賴天父。不是作為掌控者操縱結果，而是作為敬拜者獻上自己。

The wilderness temptation, therefore, is not merely a historical event or a Christological demonstration. It is a **permanent catechesis on prayer** — a divine warning against the three ways human beings turn the most sacred act of communion with God into the most profane act of self-worship.

Pusćinowe pokušenje tohodla njeje jenož historiski podawk abo christologiske předstajenje. Je to **trajna katecheza wo modlitwje** — božanske warnowanje před třomi pućemi, po kotrychž człowjekojo najswjećiši akt zhromadnosće z Bohom do najnjewosebiteho akta sebječesćowanja přeměnja.

因此，曠野試探不僅僅是一個歷史事件或基督論的展示。它是一部關於禱告的永恆要理教導——一個來自上帝的警告，警告人類將與上帝相交這最神聖的行為轉變為自我崇拜這最褻瀆之行為的三種方式。

Let the one who has ears to hear, hear.

Štóž ma wuši, zo by słyšał, njech słyši.

有耳可聽的，就應當聽。

Endnotes | Kónčne přispomnjenki | 附註

Soli Deo Gloria.

Jenož Bohu k česći.

唯獨歸榮耀於上帝。

- Derek Prince, *Shaping History Through Prayer and Fasting* (New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 2002); see also Prince's extensive audio teaching series on spiritual warfare and the nature of prayer, where he repeatedly distinguishes between faith and presumption.
- Charles H. Spurgeon, *Sermons on Prayer* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007). The quoted maxim is widely attributed to Spurgeon and appears throughout his sermonic corpus in various formulations.
- Stephen Tong, *Reformed Dogmatics* lectures (STEMI/GRII), particularly his series on the doctrine of prayer and the Creator-creature distinction. See also Tong's Evangelistic Rally sermons on the sovereignty of God.
- John F. MacArthur, *The MacArthur New Testament Commentary: Matthew 1–7* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1985), commentary on Matthew 4:1–4.
- N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), esp. chapter 10 on the temptation narrative and Jesus' recapitulation of Israel's wilderness experience.
- Jordan Peterson, *Biblical Series: Genesis* (lecture series, 2017), Lecture XI: "The Temptation in the Wilderness." See also Peterson, *12 Rules for Life* (Toronto: Random House Canada, 2018), Rule 7 on the relationship between meaning and voluntary suffering.
- Voddie Baucham, *Expository Apologetics: Answering Objections with the Power of the Word* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2015); see also Baucham's sermon series on the prosperity gospel and its theological errors.

- Ray Comfort, *God Has a Wonderful Plan for Your Life: The Myth of the Modern Message* (Bellflower, CA: Living Waters Publications, 2010).
- Robert Barron, *Catholicism: A Journey to the Heart of the Faith* (New York: Image Books, 2011); see also Barron's Word on Fire homilies on the First Sunday of Lent (Matthew 4:1–11).
- Michael S. Heiser, *The Unseen Realm: Recovering the Supernatural Worldview of the Bible* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015), esp. chapters on the divine council and the cosmic conflict motif.
- Cliffe Knechtle, *Give Me an Answer* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1986); see also Knechtle's campus Q&A sessions on the problem of unanswered prayer.
- Gary Hamrick, Cornerstone Chapel verse-by-verse sermon series on the Gospel of Matthew, sermon on Matthew 4:1–11.
- Chuck Missler, *Learn the Bible in 24 Hours* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2002); see also Missler's Koinonia House expositional commentary on Matthew.
- William Lane Craig, *Reasonable Faith: Christian Truth and Apologetics*, 3rd ed. (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2008); see also Craig's Defenders podcast, lectures on divine providence and prayer.
- Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), commentary on Matthew 4:1–11.
- Robby Gallaty, *Rediscovering Discipleship: Making Jesus' Final Words Our First Work* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2015); see also Gallaty's sermon series on spiritual disciplines and the theology of fasting.
- Fr. Chad Ripperger, *Introduction to the Science of Mental Health* (Denton, NE: Sensus Traditionis Press, 2007); see also Ripperger's lectures on demonic temptation and the discernment of spirits.

- John Bergsma, *Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Revealing the Jewish Roots of Christianity* (New York: Image Books, 2019); see also Bergsma's *The Bible and the Virgin Mary* lectures on typology in the Gospels.
- Nate Sala, Every Thought Captive Ministry, "The Temptation of Christ and Epistemological Humility" (teaching series). See also Sala's apologetic discussions on the nature of faith vs. presumption.
- Daniel Maritz (DLM Christian Lifestyle), YouTube teaching series on spiritual warfare and the modern church.
- Vlad Savchuk, *Break Free: Overcoming Spiritual, Emotional, and Relational Strongholds* (Charisma House, 2022); see also Savchuk's sermon series on the prayer life of Jesus.
- Dr. Karlo Broussard, *Prepare the Way: Overcoming Obstacles to God, the Gospel and the Church* (El Cajon, CA: Catholic Answers Press, 2018); see also Broussard's Catholic Answers Live appearances on Thomistic metaphysics and prayer.
- Charles H. Spurgeon, "The Pinnacle of the Temple," sermon No. 861, *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, Vol. 15 (1869).
- Derek Prince, *Faith to Live By* (New Kensington, PA: Whitaker House, 1977), esp. the chapter distinguishing faith from presumption.
- John F. MacArthur, *The MacArthur New Testament Commentary: Matthew 1–7*, commentary on Matthew 4:5–7; see also MacArthur's sermon "Testing God" in the Grace to You sermon archive.
- N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, chapter on the temptation narrative; see also Wright, *Matthew for Everyone, Part 1* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2004).

- Jordan Peterson, *Biblical Series*, Lecture XI; see also *Maps of Meaning: The Architecture of Belief* (New York: Routledge, 1999) on the archetype of voluntary vs. manufactured crisis.
- Kenny Burchard, Pneuma Foundation teaching articles and podcast episodes on faith, presumption, and charismatic theology.
- Matt Mason, Lion of Fire Ministries, teaching series on the temptation of Christ and contemporary Christian living.
- Fr. Chris Alar, *After Suicide: There's Hope for Them and for You* (Stockbridge, MA: Marian Press, 2019); see also Alar's EWTN appearances and his teaching series on the six sins against the Holy Spirit.
- Fr. Donald Calloway, *No Turning Back: A Witness to Mercy* (Stockbridge, MA: Marian Press, 2010).
- Dave Armstrong, *A Biblical Defense of Catholicism* (Manchester, NH: Sophia Institute Press, 2003); see also Armstrong's blog posts on the proper hermeneutics of biblical promises.
- Arlen Khachatourians, apologetics and theology teaching ministry, teachings on prayer, faith, and spiritual discernment.
- Leighton Flowers, Soteriology 101 podcast and teaching ministry, episodes on the nature of grace, patience, and prayer.
- Douglas Hamp, *Corrupting the Image: Angels, Aliens, and the Antichrist Revealed* (Defender Publishing, 2011); see also Hamp's Hebrew word studies on the concept of "testing God."
- Jeffery Poor, pastoral teaching ministry, sermons on the temptation narrative and the theology of prayer.
- G.C. Lewis Sr., teaching ministry, reflections on covenant theology, prayer, and the proper use of God's promises.

- Rikhard Hartikainen, theological reflections on ecclesiology, eschatology, and the temptation narrative.
- Stephen Tong, STEMI/GRII evangelistic rally sermons, particularly the series on the sovereignty of God and the critique of the prosperity gospel.
- Voddie Baucham, sermon series on the prosperity gospel; see also Baucham, "The Supremacy of Christ and the Gospel in a Postmodern World" (Together for the Gospel, 2008).
- Robert Barron, *The Priority of Christ: Toward a Postliberal Catholicism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2007); see also Barron's Word on Fire commentary on the Lenten Gospel readings.
- Michael S. Heiser, *The Unseen Realm*, chapters on Deuteronomy 32 worldview and the rebellion of the divine council; see also Heiser's *Supernatural* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2015).
- John Lennox, *Against the Flow: The Inspiration of Daniel in an Age of Relativism* (Oxford: Monarch Books, 2015); see also Lennox's lectures on autonomy, worship, and the modern idolatry of self-determination.
- Charlie Kirk, public addresses and podcast episodes on faith, culture, and the temptation of platform.
- David Diga Hernandez, *Carriers of the Glory: Becoming a Friend of the Holy Spirit* (Shippensburg, PA: Destiny Image, 2017); see also Hernandez's teaching series on the proper orientation of spiritual power.
- Bro Dr Prem, theological teaching ministry, series on the nature of true prayer and the Creator-creature relationship.
- Fr. Dan Reehil, pastoral homilies and spiritual direction teachings on the temptation narrative and the practice of prayer.
- Vlad Savchuk, sermon series on the prayer life of Jesus and the surrender of control.

- John Bergsma, lectures on Eucharistic typology in the Gospels; see also Bergsma and Pitre, *A Catholic Introduction to the Bible: The Old Testament* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2018).
- Karlo Broussard, Catholic Answers Live and public lectures on the virtue of religion in Thomas Aquinas and its application to the spiritual life.
- Attributed to Charles H. Spurgeon, widely cited across his sermonic corpus; cf. *Morning and Evening: Daily Readings* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991).